REPORT RESUMES

ED 010 601 24

DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW APPROACH TO TEACHING INTRODUCTORY SOCIAL SCIENCE IN COLLEGE. FINAL REPORT.

BY- DOWD, DOUGLAS F.
CORNELL UNIV., ITHACA, N.Y.
REPORT NUMBER BR-6-2132 PUB DATE AUG 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$7.84 196P.

DESCRIPTORS- EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS, EXPERIMENTAL TEACHING, EXPERIMENTAL CURRICULUM, *ECONOMICS, *SOCIAL SCIENCES, TEACHING METHODS, EDUCATIONAL EXPERIMENTS, *SUMMER PROGRAMS, *INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION, *INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH, *COLLEGE INSTRUCTION, ITHACA, NEW YORK

AN EXPERIMENTAL SUMMER COURSE IN ECONOMICS WAS PRESENTED TO 53 PREFRESHMAN COLLEGE STUDENTS. THE 6-WEEK COURSE ENTAILED LECTURES AND DISCUSSIONS. ONCE A WEEK THE ENTIRE CLASS WAS BROKEN INTO SMALL GROUPS THAT WOULD MEET WITH A SECTION INSTRUCTOR OR LECTURER TO DISCUSS A SPECIFIC READING. AT LEAST ONCE A WEEK, A FILM RELEVANT TO THE COURSE WAS PRESENTED AND DISCUSSED. THE STUDENTS AND STAFF EXAMINED ONE QUESTION IN DEPTH IN OPPOSITION TO THE TRADITIONAL METHOD OF PRESENTING MATERIAL IN AN INTRODUCTORY COURSE. INSTRUCTORS FROM DISCIPLINES OTHER THAN ECONOMICS DELIVERED LECTURES THAT ATTEMPTED TO TIE THEIR OWN DISCIPLINES TO THE SPECIAL QUESTION OF THE COURSE, WHICH WAS "WHY ARE THERE POOR PEOPLE IN A RICH SOCIETY LIKE THE UNITED STATES." THE PROGRAM PROVED QUITE SUCCESSFUL, AND EVIDENCES OF THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS ARE SHOWN IN THE FORM OF ESSAYS PREPARED BY THE STUDENTS, BY THE RECORDED STATEMENTS OF THE STUDENTS MADE AT THE BEGINNING AND AT THE END OF INSTRUCTION, AND BY EVALUATIONS MADE BY THE INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF. (GD)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW APPROACH TO TEACHING INTRODUCTORY SOCIAL SCIENCE IN COLLEGE.

A Final Report Of

U.S. OFFICE of Education Project #6-2132-20

conducted by

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

July 2 to August 19, 1966

directed by

Douglas F. Dowd

ED010601

INTRODUCTION

This report consists of the following materials:

1. The report of Douglas F. Dowd, Cornell University, Director of the project and the Instructor in Economics. Appended are Appendix A, listing reference books used in the course; Appendix B, listing the principles underlying the course; Appendix C, before and after essays of each student enrolled in the course.

2. The report of Michael Maccoby, Cuernavaca, Mexico, Psychologist, Instructor in Psychology.

3. The report of Sister Marie Augusta Neal, Chairman of the Department of Sociology, Emmanuel College, Instructor in Sociology.

4. The report of John C. Rensenbrink, Department of Government, Bowdoin College, Instructor in Political Science.

5. The term paper of James Buyoucos, a student in the course.

6. The term paper of Clifford Sessions, a student in the course.

7. The report of Eugene Lichtenstein, New York City, participating on the staff of the project as an evaluator.

These materials are presented to explain the background of the project, its purposes, and its outcomes. Evidences of the accomplishments are exemplified in the form of essays prepared by the students and by their recorded statements made at the beginning and at the end of the instruction.

In addition to the change reflected in student attitudes and understandings, as shown in the comparison of student statements, the results of the project also are reviewed from the standpoint of the instructional staff.

Final Report, U.S. Office of Education, Project
6-2132-20, "Development of a New Approach to
Teaching Introductory Social Science in College."
D. F. Dowd

A. Basic structure

1. The project materialized in the summer of 1966 at Cornell University, in the form of a course entitled Social Science A, financed by the U.S. Office of Education.

2. The origins of the project were in a two-week long conference at Tufts University beginning August 29, 1965 (brought into being jointly by the Office of Education, the Educational Services, Inc., and the National Science Foundation). That conference, which had humanists and natural scientists as well as social scientists present, stimulated the formation of a social science group within it, which then went on to subsequent conferences at Rutgers University (for five days) and at M.I.T. (for two days) during the winter. Between September, 1965 and May, 1966, efforts to develop the basic ideas of the experimental course and to find financing for its presentation continued. The Office of Education made a grant of $51,000 in May, 1966.

3. The staff consisted of the following: D.F. Dowd (Cornell University), Professor of Economics, and Director of the Course; Sister Marie Augusta Neal, S.N.D., (Emmanuel College, Boston), Professor of Sociology; John Rensenbrink (Bowdoin College), Professor of Political Science; Michael Maccoby (Univ. of California, Santa Cruz, beginning fall of 1966) sociologist and psychoanalyst; Eugene Lichtenstein, New York City, Journalist, filmmaker, and college teacher (English); Gloria Joseph, David Boesel, and Gerald Surette, advanced graduate students at Cornell University, in, respectively, psychology, government, and economics, who served as section instructors and counselors; and, finally, half a dozen undergraduate students at Cornell who served as secretaries, typists, counselors, and the like.

4. The students were deliberately sought out so as to give us as much of a representative sample as time and finances allowed. All admittees to Cornell (irrespective of college) were invited, as was also true for Emmanuel College. High school counselors in New York, Pennsylvania and New Jersey were sent brochures announcing the course, and so on. A special effort was made to induce entering students of Cornell's (unfortunately titled) Disadvantaged Students Program. Twelve of these students enrolled (all of them Negroes), with results to be noted below. Because we did not receive our grant until early May, we were much hampered in our ability

to gain a sufficient number of students. All students were pre-freshman. They were not told what the course would be about, but only that it would be an inter-disciplinary social science course, and that they would be given six hours credit for it. There were 53 students.

5. Classes began on July 5 and ended on August 12, 1966. Classes met for three and one-half hours five days a week. The first hour and a half was taken up with a lecture and a discussion, in which all members of the staff would interact with the lecturer in both a critical and a supporting fashion (and students were also part of the discussion). After a break of thirty minutes sections would begin, under the direction of the section instructors. Sometimes, but not always, the lecturing staff would sit in on the sections. Once a week the entire class was broken into small groups that would meet with a section instructor or lecturer to discuss a specific reading. At least once a week, a film relevant to the course was presented in the evening, followed by a discussion.

6. Students were asked to buy ten paperback books, and an additional thirty or so were placed in the course office in quantities of ten apiece, which the students were allowed to borrow overnight. (The books used are listed in Appendix A.)

7. Students lived in the men's and women's dorms, but ate lunch and dinner together, in the women's dorm.

B. Evaluation of the summer course

1. The impulse to develop the experimental course had two sides to it: a) we believe that the typical introductory course in the separate disciplines at its worst is deadening, simplistic, overly-abstract or overly-descriptive, coercive to the learning process, "canned", seemingly or in fact irrelevant to the society within which it takes place, and that it lacks dynamic meaning to the student. Even at its best, the typical introductory course possesses some or most of these characteristics. In our view, its symbol is the exam plus textbook, its assumptions that there is some vital core of material concerning which all students "should" be interested, and that the students are by and large an undifferentiated mass; b) we believe, on the other hand, that the first course in social science can and should be intellectually liberating, challenging, and exciting, that all of the questions dealt with by social scientists are inherently complex (whether or not they are dealt with as such), that learning takes place best not through the coercive lecture, reading assignment, and exam, but through

the increasing involvement of the student in the process of inquiry, that this latter is likely to be made the more possible as the inquiry is in fact an inquiry, aimed at analysis and understanding, rather than a set of materials to be learned, and that this in turn will be enhanced to the degree that, in an initial exposure, the inquiry turns on a question of obvious moment. We believe also that the capabilities and inclinations of students, which all acknowledge as being diverse, will best be utilized when there are diverse paths open to students in any particular class -- which in turn implies getting away from textbooks and exams and moving toward complex reading possibilities, reports, and research papers. (See Appendix B)

2. As we began to develop the course, in the past year, we met the frequent (and frequently scornful) objection that "problems approaches," and "inter-disciplinary" approaches had (of course) been tried before. Our approach was not a "problems" approach, nor the usual "inter-disciplinary" approach. We wished to have the students and the staff examine one question in depth. We believe that an adequate time to examine one such question is one academic year (and one of the critical constraints on the experimental course was that we had only six weeks, a period of time too short to allow the kind of absorption and reflection that significant intellectual development entails). The question we posed for the course was "Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?" Normally what is suggested by that question is given a week, at most, in a course in economics, or sociology, and is not taken up at all in psychology or political science. When it is taken up, it is taken as "the problem of poverty." We took it up as a question, and one that in fact no single member of the teaching staff could answer adequately.

3. The procedure followed by the lecturers was in general to deliver broad lectures that attempted to tie their own disciplines to the special question of the course. As the economist in the course, for example, I delivered two lectures on basic institutions and background of capitalist economies, and of modern American capitalism, one lecture on the analysis and the facts of income distribution in America (with special emphasis on lower income levels), two lectures that attempted to relate the macro and micro functioning of the economy to the emergence and the persistence of poverty, and a final lecture on economic policies respecting poverty. All these lectures might find their way with such titles in a conventional economics course; I can only say that they were formulated and delivered in a manner significantly different from the conventional (or at least as I have delivered them before) because of the context within which they were developed, and their formulation with

respect to a particular question. In a year-long course I would expect to deliver at least fifteen lectures. The purpose of the discussion sections was principally to push further into the lecture materials, as is common; however, the fact that the lectures were from four separate disciplines, and the section instructors trained in one, made not only for enhanced possibilities but also for certain problems (to be discussed under recommendations).

4. It is a mark of the success of the course, in my opinion, that at its conclusion the students felt they could not answer the question well let alone simply; whereas, at the initiation of the course the students mostly felt they knew the answer. It is an honest statement also to record here that the teaching staff too is now more aware of the complexities of the question than when the course began -- as would be so, we believe, of any such question, whether it revolved around automation, freedom, underdevelopment, or whatever. As partial evidence for this point, we have compiled in Appendix C the students' responses to the question of the course, in two parts. On the first day of the course, before the students knew what the course was about, we had them sit and write for about thirty minutes an answer to the question. We assured them they would not be graded on the basis of their answers. On the last day of classes, the process was repeated. The appendix contains the two answers of each student, and it demonstrates not that any student now can answer the question in a succinct and fulsome manner, but that the mode of answer, the factors taken into consideration, the degree of awareness and involvement, among other matters, have for most of the students undergone a shift upward. For example, the girl we took to be the best student in the first week (Eleanor Dorsey), we took to be the best student at the end of the course. But the *kind* of analysis she offered underwent a noticeable and desirable transformation. Much the same was true of those we took to be mediocre or poor students. We believe that one vital difference between the approach we followed this summer and the typical approach is that the students became aware of the need for, and the desirability of, *theory*, and learned to distinguish between an argument based on evidence and logic and an assertion based on, at best, seeming plausibility. Obviously, most social scientists attempt to bring about that condition in their students, whatever the format of their courses. We too have made that effort in our more conventional courses. It is our conviction, however, that the attempt has some larger chance of success when the course is presented in the multi-disciplinary, questioning format (and with those other techniques we have tried), and the chances of success with the more traditional mode have already been demonstrated as being slight indeed.

fulsome means sickening

5. A vital element in the teaching of the course was spontaneity. This was taken to be so before the course began, and it was maintained as an intent throughout the course. In practice, spontaneity meant that each member of the instructional staff taught not only in terms of what he knew but in terms of what he was learning, or being confronted with. The lecturers, for example, although each had a general idea of the principal contents of the six or so lectures he would deliver over the course, in fact prepared each lecture not until the day before its delivery, in order to work with the living and growing materials of the course itself. The economist would deliver two lectures, say, to be followed by two lectures by the psychologist and two by the sociologist. But the economist's second lecture was modified by the discussion following his first lecture, and the psychologist's similarly, and so on throughout the course. As the economist in the course, I know that my fourth and fifth lectures, delivered in the fifth week of the course, could not have been given by me in the first week, nor would I have been impelled to do so. The lectures were, in other words, not the lectures of discrete social scientists, coming in to cooperate in an inter-disciplinary course, but developments of materials much affected by what had preceded them as offered by the staff in its entirety. A questionnaire developed by one of the students -- which stood for his research paper -- showed that this feature of the course came through to the students as being most valuable, not least becasue it allowed them to believe that the teaching staff was interested and involved in the course materials as participants, not merely as hired experts.

6. Another vital element in the course was that it allowed open and continuous controversy, among and between students, between students and staff, and within the staff itself. Most of this controversy was intellectual and friendly, but a good part of it was emotional and heated, and we felt that this served a constructive intellectual purpose. Frequently throughout the course, for example, students would express the notion that they had come to a new realization of their own attitudes, and of the meaning of the attitudes of others, through what had been a prolonged or even a painful controversy. Such controversies occurred in the classroom, but also at mealtimes (frequently joined by the staff), and in the discussion periods following the presentation of films. It is important to point out that the controversy was genuine, not staged.

7. The lectures and discussions dealt appropriately and frequently with concepts, descriptive materials, and the like, where necessary and apt. But our emphasis was on locating and relating to each other the dynamic forces at work_ in the individual, the society, the economy, and in

government that, taken together, brought into existence and allowed to persist a large number of poor people in a rich society like the United States. Our approach as teachers (and this was mirrored in the reading, as well) was thus one that combined the theoretical, the historical, and the empiral materials of our disciplines, and one that required, at the same time that it allowed, our separate disciplines to become joined to the others. The outcome, which we had hoped for, was that the students (and the teaching staff) became aware of the complexity of the issue under examination (and could easily believe that any such issue would be similarly complex), at the same time that they became aware of the possibilities that disciplined analysis offers for the understanding of complex social questions. Something else of importance must be mentioned: The role of the psychologist in the course was critical, in that it allowed the students to understand that it was not "others" who thought, believed, behaved in certain ways, but that each of us is one of those "others" and that each of us is, no less than any other, a participating, responsible or irresponsible, member of the society. The students were brought to a level of self-consciousness and self-awareness that made it more likely that they would be able to "hear" and "see" what was made available to them; and, no less important, become motivated to find out more for themselves. It is worthwhile here to pay special attention to the role played by the "disadvantaged students" in the summer course. These students were given a somewhat more forceful invitation to enroll because the members of the Cornell Program (of which Gloria Joseph and I are both members) wished to decelerate the programs of these students. There is no doubt whatsoever that the summer program was of great importance to the twelve Negro students enrolled, insofar as it acquainted them with college level materials, the use of the library, the preparation of research papers, and, perhaps most important of all, made them feel at home in the university atmosphere before the pressures of the regular semester begin. But there was an important and unintended side effect for the course as a whole. Because the Negro students were from predominantly impoverished urban or rural areas, and Negroes to boot, their own lives were a rich source of experience and commentary for the course, given its focus. The staff was unanimous in its belief that the presence of these students did more than many books or films to make the problem of poverty and one of its accomplices, racial discrimination, come alive; and it must be said that many of the white students seemed to arrive at a new realization of their own prejudices.

8. It would be easy to conclude from what has gone before that our experimental course had as its consequence, perhaps even as its aim, that students would become social activists,

emotionally charged, and so on. Indeed, as the course was being developed at Tufts and Rugers, we were accused of having such matters in mind as goals. We protested (not, we hope, too much) that our aim was to develop an attitude of respect for the prodecures of science, the complexity of society, and an understanding of inquiry in relation to social science and the inquirer. Our students, too, at first believed that we were trying to "brainwash" them, not least because they were accumstomed (already!) to the antiseptic air of a classroom ruled by an expert dispensing knowledge. An attitude of inquiry is, we believe, necessarily a critical attitude, and the naive can easily believe that any criticism (in either the intellectual or the social sense of the term) is made by one who has a program (intellectual or social) in mind. To put it bluntly, our students initially believed that we were going to try to answer the "why?" question for a few weeks, and then confront them with a socialist program to change America, in the last week or so, a program that they would be unable to resist swallowing, having been prepared for it. That the students did not see matters that way at the end, that some of them at least are now much interested in pursuing social science, that basic political attitudes did not change (indeed were, we believe, given reinforcement), that, in sum, the students captured in large part the spirit that we said we had, is as much as we can say. We believe the course was a great success (despite shortcomings to be noted below), and that its success is measured by what happened to students and staff in its process -- and that what happened is that we all became more likely to become better social scientists than might otherwise have been the case.

C. Recommendations

1. The course had virtues other than those mentioned above, and defects other than those I shall mention now, but I trust that in the reports of the other members of the staff those gaps will be filled. It is my view that the principal defect of the course as given was in the role played in the sections. The section instructors, all graduate students in the traditional disciplines, had inadequate ability (not their "fault") to grapple with the materials outside their own disciplines. We knew this would be so, and we planned to overcome that problem in part by having one member of the senior staff sit in each section. It my view, although this was welcomed by the students, it was nevertheless worse than nothing. The section instructors, whatever they may have said about this question, convinced me that having one member of the senior staff present in section was demoralizing to them, that it eroded their role in the classroom, and laid them open either to being replaced de facto each day as section instructor, and/or to being "exposed" as inadequate.

Although it is quite reasonable to argue that teachers can gain the respect of their students by saying "I don't know," when that is so, it is an unlikely occurrence, especially for young teachers. Be that as it may, it was not until the very end of the course that the section instructors felt comfortable -- if then -- having one of the lecturers in the section. We recommend that if and when this course is given in a full-year sequence that the section instructors be chosen from among experienced teaching assistants and that they attend a pro-seminar in the semester preceding the course. In this way the inadequacies of section instructors (and of the lecturers) would be significantly reduced, and the largest difficulty in the course removed. That implies, of course, time and budjet that exceeds by far the normal amounts devoted to a beginning course. That is perhaps to say nothing more than that the normal beginning course is "undertaught."

2. Our principal constraint was time. We grumbled at first at having only fifty-three, instead of the hoped-for two hundred and fifty (an unavoidable development, given the lateness of the aware). However, the small number, when placed against the short time period of the course, was a blessing, for the constraints of time *plus* a very large class might well have prevented us from engaging in a meaningful experiment. The students had much reading to do, and in addition had to undertake a research paper (much more limited in focus than the question of the course, but of course related to it). Also, the materials of the lectures, readings, and films were such as to pose new and confusing perspectives to the students, and much discussion in and out of the classroom was essential if even the beginnings of comprehension were to take place. Six weeks, no matter how many hours per day might be spent within those weeks, is entirely too little time for the educational process to take good hold in general, let alone with respect to the complex materials we presented. We believe with great strength that a course such as this should occupy at least one year, with two or three lectures a week, and much discussion. It is my own belief that such a course would be laboring against great odds if it were mixed with an otherwise conventional curriculum. I shall propose that the Arts College at Cornell University allow something like ten percent of an incoming class to engage in a curriculum of humanities, natural science, and social science all working on the principles (appropriately modified for subject matter) embodied in the experimental course, for one and possibly two years. To maximize the chances for success, I believe that living arrangements for the students should also be developed along lines different from the normal, with graduate assistants (and where feasible, members of the lecturing staff) living with the students in living quarters which would be marked out for the experimental group alone.

Appendix A

Cornell University
Summer Session 1966

SOCIAL SCIENCE A

The following books are on sale at the Cornell Campus Bookstore (Barnes Hall). Students should purchase and read all of them. They are all in paperback editions.

M. Harrington, THE OTHER AMERICA

H. Miller, RICH MAN, POOR MAN

E. Fromm, ESCAPE FROM FREEDOM

R. Neustadt, PRESIDENTIAL POWER

W. McCord, SPRINGTIME OF FREEDOM

A. Lewis, GIDEON'S TRUMPET

D. Berman, A BILL BECOMES A LAW

H. Meissner (ed.), POVERTY IN THE AFFLUENT SOCIETY

S. Freud, CIVILIZATION AND ITS DISCONTENTS

The following books are on loan from Room 14 Rockefeller Hall. They exist in ample quantities, and may be checked out at hours to be announced.

M.S. Gordon, POVERTY IN AMERICA

J. Lyford, THE TALK IN VANDALIA

D. Dowd, MODERN ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

E. Fromm, MARX'S CONCEPT OF MAN

E. Fromm, MAN FOR HIMSELF; also, THE HEART OF MAN

B.F. Skinner, WALDEN TWO

E. Erikson, CHILDHOOD AND SOCIETY

Maccoby, Newcomb, Hartley, eds., READINGS IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY (3rd ed.)

Appendix A (con't)

R. Coles, THE MIGRANT FARMER

W. Lippmann, PUBLIC OPINION

J. Dewey, THE PUBLIC AND ITS PROBLEMS

A. Schonfeld, MODERN CAPITALISM

W. H. Whyte, STREET CORNER SOCIETY

J. Piaget, THE MORAL JUDGMENT OF THE CHILD

J. K. Galbraith, THE AFFLUENT SOCIETY

O. Ornati, POVERTY AND AFFLUENCE

G. Kolko, WEALTH AND POWER IN AMERICA

O. Lewis, FIVE FAMILIES

A. Hollingshead, ELMTOWN YOUTH

R. Goldwin, ed., POLITICAL PARTIES USA

H. Zinn, SNCC, THE NEW ABOLITIONISTS

H. Pritchett, THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM

C.W. Mills, POWER ELITE

W. Stringfellow, MY PEOPLE IS THE ENEMY

H. Meissner, POVERTY IN THE AFFLUENT SOCIETY

F. Bator, THE QUESTION OF GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Bobbs-Merrill Reprints in Sociology

Appendix B

Draft for the Principles Underlying a Course in Social Science

A. The social sciences aspire to accuracy of analysis, interpretation, and prediction, and yet deal with the human person. This implies dimensions over and above the order and randomness of the data treated by the physical sciences.

Human beings are alive, which means that they are constantly changing, in transition from the past to the future. This change is a process acted upon by economic, political, social, and psychological forces. Yet, man is also unique in the sense that he can become conscious of the forced acting upon him and he can influence them, which means that he can be morally responsible for them and therefore for their result which is he himself. For this reason, it is desirable that human problems as they are now in the process of being lived be the central focus of the teaching of the social sciences, so that both student and scholar deepen their awareness of the interrelationship between knowledge and decision.

B. The humanities and the social sciences both consider human experience but face it from a different perspective and with different methods. They share the free use of imagination along with the necessity of uncritical modes of subjective interpretation. They also share the possibility of going beyond common sense concepts and cultural stereotypes to a more accurate perception of reality by a critical examination of appearances. The humanist analyzes by critically examining his own response, while the scientist must produce systematic interpretations which stand the test of generalized criteria. Thus, the interaction of student and social scientist must have built into it the student's effort to demand from the scientist proof and demonstration.

C. Because the social sciences study social relations in which men in their daily lives are culturally embedded and because they deal with them in their changing forms with historical perspective and future projections, it is difficult for the student and the scholar to gain objective perspective on the object of analysis. He must learn to become aware to the degree that his way of seeing is influenced by cultural stereotypes, ideology, and categories of consciousness. For this reason, it is desirable that from the beginning of his experience with the social sciences the student develop his motivation and skill in discriminating reality from the convention and the illusory. Traditional courses in the social sciences do not effectively focus on either motivation or skill in the introductory course.

D. Because the proposed experiment takes the form of an interdisciplinary course, it must take cognizance of both the possibilities and the dangers in such a format. If the possibilities of genuine interaction among participating scholars are to be realized, there must be a dialogue among the social scientists in each teaching session of the course - a dialogue that involves not only hearing the others out, but each responding to the others actively in the classroom, where the students can both hear and speak. One of the dangers of such an approach, that it could lead to confusion and analytical chaos, requires new methods for preserving direction, capturing new insights, and incorporating them into the developing framework and content.

Appendix C: The Before and After Essays of Each Student.

Question: Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

BAIRD, BRUCE

Essay #1=

There are undoubtedly a myriad of reasons why there is poverty in a society like the U.S.A. THe only one, however, of which I have any knowledge is the historical reason. Throughout history and within all societies there have always been poor people. THis class of poor has always been composed of those will little cleverness or ambition, and, secondarily, of people who (becuase of oppression or lack of opportunity) have never had the chance to prove themselves. THe richness or power of society gives many opportunities to those who otherwise would have no chance, but even in such welfare states as the Roman empire in the latter part of its existence, opportunity could not be given to everyone, and there were always the chronically poor. Instances like this can be given throughout history of large, rich, welfare-oriented societies with many poor people. The U.S. today is no exception. Even with increased education, there are still people who don't care or are not intelligent enough to take opportunities offered to them. THus it seems to me that unless really extreme measures are taken to guarantee everyone a certain income (which seems unfeasible even with the riches of the US) the poor will still remain with us.

Essay #2

Why are there poor people in a rich socidty like the U.S.?

This question is, I believe, completley unanswerable in the context of a six weeks course such as we have just gone through. A really vast knowledge of economics, political science, sociology, psychology and their interactions with each other, would be necessary to even gegin to scratch the surface of this problem. All of the lecturers were distinguished in their fields, yet none could do more than give a series of partial explanation in their own fields of the problem. Of course I could regurgitate some of these partial explanation (economically - the poor exist becuase American capitalism as it works at the present time benefits only the middle and upper classes and the gap is widening. Politically - the poor exist because they have no power, and American "democracy" today is governed by the action of pressure groups on Congress, the President, and the rest of our governmental apparatus. Sociologically - the poor exist because the poor in our society have developed a culture of poverty which perpetuates itself. Psychologically - the poor exist because our society, in its concentration on material welfare, is becoming more necrophilic, and thus has less interest in humanism and life), but thse still do not even scratch the surface of the problem. THerefore I must conclude that I cannot possibly give an answer to this question which would throw any light whatsoever on the problem.

BEST, JAMES

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in arich society like the United States? Because it is part of the American way of life. With our capitalistic system someone will always be considered poor, economically at least. And socially, too, because people today tend to judge a person by material things.

No matter what is done to combat poverty in the United States there will always be people considered as poor people. Suppose you raise the standard of living of the poor, everyone else's is gaining to rise. And you've done nothing.

What I am trying to say is that even though the living standard of the present day poor man is raised to the above average standard someone is going to have a below average living standard because the standard goes up. A poor man today would have been considered well off in the 18th century.

There will always be poor people in the United States, economically because of every man's ambition to be better than his neighbor.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States? There has to be, in order for the economic system to function and to support the American ideal.

Our economic system is set up so that in order for someone to improve himself in this business world somebody has got to get hurt. People are no longer worried about other people except what they can get from them. For instance if you owed a little grocery store and you were just breaking even. Then down the street a big super market is built and as a result, you are put out of business, tough luck, that's capitalism. What happens to this man if he can't find work? He could very easily become one of Harrington's 50 million poor. This example is probably over simplified but basically this is what can and has happened. This is progress, the American way.

The American way, get as much as you can, for as little as you can, anyway you can. And when you have 180 million people all them thinking this way you can't help but have a rich man and a poor man, people breaking laws and being discriminated against.

There will always be poor people in America unless the system is changed and that will take a long time. There wouldn't be any free enterprise if people didn't believe they couldn't get rich. That's why people come to America to get rich and they're getting rich but because someone is becoming poorer. The only thing that can possibly be done is to decrease the number of poor and allow them to have the same chance as the people on the right side of the tracks.

In this course I learned that there will always be poor people but also that they can be helped. Some people probably just won't be able to make it but you can understand and help them and give them the same rights an opportunities as everyone else. Understanding and being aware of the problem is one step in improving the situation.

BLANCHARD, PAUL

ESSAY # 1

I choose to think of the poverty situation as a psychological problem of inertia in the welfare society.

At the present, I believe that the main force allowing the existence of poverty is the lack of motivation among the members of the welfare society. Here we have upwards of five and six generations who have relegated themselves to this disparaging life, living, as it were, off the blood of the taxpayer. Certainly, this is easier than to work for a living, but the life that is lead can't, in some cases, be called a life, it is a subsistence.

It is human to try to better oneself; to achieve something above what you already have; to advance your social status. If not just the fact of seeing an impressive building, etc., and wondering how it got to be, when the impoverished observer has naught seen such as before. This has to kindle some interest or desire; why doesn't it, or if it does, why isn't there an attempt to alleviate it, to acquire it as a tangible possession? Animals will fight for possession of something as trivial as an old bone. Yet, man has designed and produced many new things tobe desired. Why is there no motivation among these people to acquire them?

As it stands, I am not competent enough to answer the proposed questions, yet.

ESSAY # 2

It's my contention that it is a lack of initiative on the part of the poor that prevents their entrance into the higher echelons of the society. It must be conceded that initiative is the motivating force of the individual; the thing that makes him strive to improve himself and hispposition.

But it isn't that the poor, to the greater extent, lack initiative so much as that this initiative is suppressed. And the suppressive agent is sociological prejudice.

For example, a poor person cannot bet a good education because he is not 'qualified' for it. 'Qualified' takes on all meaning, the poor are indigent, the poor are that way because they wish to be, they have been and always will be that way,etc. An employer in any skilled business will hire those whose education qualifies them for the job or those who have experience. The poor can't get hired for their lack of education and because they can't get a job, they can't get experience. It's a vicious circle they can't break.

Or, take the Negro poor. According to Harrington, a Negro college graduate has the earning power of a white who has graduated from the eighth grade. That provides one hell of an incentive for the education aspiring Negro.

The forestated are just two of the many examples of why the poor are lacking in initiative. Many more still remain which harass the poor, deny them opportunity, sap their initiative.

Why should they try to impress the remaining 3/4 of the society when that society can't even see them through their inbred prejudice towards the poor? The answer is, why need they?

BRAUER, KATHLEEN

ESSAY #1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U.S.A.?

When I think of poor people in the United States, I picture a poverty-pocket such as a slum section of a city. There are Negro, Chinese, whites - all races of people living there with the same general problems.

I think everyone in some way is prejudiced and to me this is the number one problem of poverty stricken people. No matter how or why they came to be poor, they all suffer as victims of social prejudice.

From the educational viewpoint, a person may be poor physically because he is poor knowledge-wise. He cannot rise to a higher class simply because he is not educated. He may not even know how to read or write. And then the ancient problem of pride appears; his pride won't allow him to seek an education when ~~is~~ he is growing old and he may try to convince himself that he is educated enough.

Another well-known poverty section of the country is Appalachia. One of the greatest problems here, I believe, is a lack of communication with the affluent city-dwellers. Most of these people neversaw a telephone, radio., or television. They are contented with their social standing because they are not under the pressure that a normal person is. Their neighbors are poor also and their apathetic attitudes seem to be passed from generation to generation.

If these people were only well educated we would have much less of a poverty-problem in the U. S. I recently heard of an organization who was shipping coke, pancake, etc. mixes to destitute people in the hills of Virginia. Later they found out that the mixes were not being used because the people could not read the directions. How frustrating it must be for the people involved!

It is true that an education is a "doorway to the sky". There is such a shortage of teachers, doctors, technicians, etc. And so many are out of work because their education does not provide for these jobs.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U. S.?

The reason why there are about 50 million poor poeple living today in the U. S. today is such a complicated problem that it wauld take years and years of study before one could provide an acceptable answer.

But we must begin sometime and as members of a social science class, we have. Let us look at the poverty problem from the view of the four social sciences - psychology, political science, economics, and sociology.

When we look at the poverty-stricken from a psychological viewpoint we want to know their feelings, their motivation and their interests. What makes a poor person "tick?" Why can't he rise out of the isolation and frustration he feels as a member of the very lowest class? The poor man is exploited by the upper classes. When it's an election year he is promised the moon but year after year he keeps on gettingthe same promises and the same rejection and disappointment. The real poor really cannot "fight city hall" because they are isolated from the rest of society. "Strength lies in numbers" is a maxim that cannot possibly be applied to the poor, for although there are 50 million of them they are not united; they have no power. Without power where can they go? It seems that they can only sink further down in their depression and lack of hope.

As political scientists we can look at the system of government in the U. S. and the lower class participation in it. In the democratic and republican parties where can a person with no monetary or political influence compete with the boss machinary? It is common knowledge that without a good education a tremendous campaign fund one has no hope of running for even the smallest office. And where can the indigent person turn then - not to his representative, as we have seen.

Economically, the U. S. is run under a capitalistic system. Does each person get what he deserves in the system? How do you explain how hard a migrant worker works for a dollar a day and how a corporation official earns a thousand by just picking up his phone?

From the soicology viewpoint what are the upper classes doing for the poor? Where is the interaction - in the country clubs and slums? The poor cannot move out of their ghettos because the upper classes are afraid of any social change.

BROWN, RAYMOND

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U. S. A.?

The reason that there are poor people in a rich society is that most of the rich people are indifferent to the problem of being poor. Most rich people are only concerned with their own economic group and have no concern for those in a group beneath theirs. The main concern of the economic group of rich people is the group above them. Each one wants to become a member of a higher economic group and as they leave one group for another they will push back in their minds the thoughts of their former group and only look forward. Unless the rich high income groups look back at their past and try to help the people who are in the same situation which they were in, there will always be poor people in a rich society. The poor can only be helped by the rich and until the time that they do the problem will remain.

Most poor epople inherited poverty and their children are usually born into the same group. With a background of poverty and little hope for anything much better, poor people have to take small steps to rise to something better. They have no model in their family history of someone who has overcome this handicap to move up to a rich group. Therefore the rich group must go down to help them and give them the example they need and help them to get the experience necessary to move up in society.

ESSAY # 2

There is poverty amid affluence for many reasons:

1) Politically the poor have no power to lift their level of living. They are manipulated by the power elite who feel that in order to insure and safeguard that position it is necessary to suppress the poor. The poor can't fight for any power because they are most likely to be punished in some way for rebelling against the system. The power elite abviously has it's own interests to protect and won't relinquish any of the power that it has. It rests on the middle class, the bourgeosie to solve this problem. The middle class may be acombination of those people who have just arrived in their present position from a state of poverty or at least lower classeconomic existence. Among these people who have had the luck and the drive to move up the social ladder there is a great need for power,the same power that the power elite possess. In order to get this power they will have to be hard and manipulate those beneath them economically just as they are manipulated from above. From all these things it is not hard to see that similar to the upper clzss the middle class wants more power and refuses to give up any for fear of losing it all. Because of this they have a policy of apathy and non-action towards the poor and poverty.

Being manipulated by all these groups with power and not being able to rebell because of their lack of power the poor are put into a stagnant gold fish bowl into which all can look in and see the misery but no one wants the job of cleaning the bowl.

BROWN, RAYMOND - cont'd.

2) From a psychologically view, the poor exist because they have existed in a society of poverty. They were raised in an environment of misery, hunger, went, ignorance and all the rest. Many of the poor are in broken homes where the father has deserted the mother, leaving them to do for themselves. He may have been driven from the house by a feeling of frustration at being unable to find a job, support his family in the way he would like, being continually ridiculed because he isn't fulfilling the masculine role. These conditions are beyond his control and trying to fight it adds to his frustration.

BUYOUCOS, JAMES

ESSAY # 1

One of the major reasons there is poverty is that all men and women are not created equal. Many people are born with mental and physical defects. Many are born with a certain color or racial characteristic which will hold them back, and millions are born into an environment which will not give them a chance in 100 of making it.

Thus many people are not given an equal chance to compete for wealth in today's society. However, given the above unfairness and injustice there could still be no poverty in America because the country is so rich and could provide for a decent standard of living for everybody. However most people don't give a damn about others so very little has been done to eradicate poverty because this is a democracy and the majority rules and the majority doesn't care to do anything about this situation.

ESSAY # 2

I still say the main reason there are poor people is that people aren't created equal, that is with equal abilities and more important equal opportunities. Poor people are denied equal opportunity by society in that they are discriminated against in jobs, schools, housing and other areas. Also, they grow up with a "psychology of poverty." Their environment doesn't prepare them to succeed in middle class terms. This psychology of poverty is a vicious circle which is passed from generation to generation.

There are two main reasons why poor people remain poor.
1. Lack of organization for political power - poor people are unable to gain enough power to pass legislation which would be able to help them out of poverty.

2. The middle and upper classes have done very little to help the poor out of their position.

However, this is all within the framework of out American open class system of capitalism, which in a very broad sense could be the cause of all our porblems.

CONNOLLY, ANN_MARIE

Essay #1

Man was not created equal. Individualism is the key to most social problems, poverty outstanding. If we ~~can~~ our most benevolent government starting~~g~~ from scratch were to alot the same amount of money to each citizen to take care of his personal needs, inside of a month we would be on our way back to financial inequality. A new economic strata would be formed. Those who had shrewdly invested or saved miserly would have more than those who had been robbed or who had gambled or indulged themselves. It's the individual tastes, morality, intelligence of the citizen - gourmets, thieves, economists.

Environment plays a most important part in forming the individual outlook of the poor person - on his attitude toward self improvment. An Appalachian coal miner would have far less encouragement than an unskilled city laborer, though their I.Q. and untapped ability were the same. The city worker can go to a moview talk to a wealthier neighbor. The rural citizen is tied fast to his mundane existence. Unlike a city person he can't seem to better himself or even hope for his children. Psychologically he is poor and will pass this poverty along for generations until this poverty becomes inveed. Thus we have man~~y~~ in our population who don't want to move although miserable at the bottom . (time)

Essay #2

My last essay six weeks ago stated quite clearly that the main reason there were poor people in a rich society like the United States was the psychological attitude of the poor. I realize now how very simple-minded this way. I also learned how very much I have to learn. I couldn't possible summarize the whole course in one half-hour and even if I did we still wouldn't have the answer~~s~~.

There is no reason why there should be poverty. No economic reason. We have an abundant economy and a comparatively small fra~~c~~ction of our income could guarantee security to the 50 million poor. We don't need the poor and the poor are invisible. No one in Elmstown or Webster Grove knows they are there.

The government is apathetic - catering to the powerful. The middle class is vusy getting ahead.

Perhaps the reason is me. People who haven't the guts to sacrifice themselves to this purging of their society so long as it treats them well. Now I am aware - intellectually I know what I should, what I must do. But next month I'll be buhing new clothes for school and next summer I'll be sailing and soon I'll be married and I'll tell my children what they must do - especially since I didn't make the time to do it. And maybe along the way I'll talk to friends and spreat the Gospel but this As America land of opportunity, upward mobility in a "no-class" system, and anyway who'll listen?

CORMIER, CHERYL

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States? A question of this sort must be answered from so many points of view that one answer could hardly be applicable to all.

There are poor people who are poor through no fault of their own. I refer to a poverty-stricken family who, due to the construction of the present society, cannot rise far above their own low level despite any efforts they make.

There are also poor people who are poor through their own fault, because seeing the door-way to a better life before them, they will deliberately turn away. I refer here to the type of person who "enjoys" being, who "enjoys" living off the wealth of others merely so that he'll have to make no effort to provide for himself. To this type of person, more than money would have to be provided to erase the label of 'poor'. Also to be erased would be adjectives such as irresponsible, lazy and ignorant, of his own accord.

There are poor people who are rich in many things the rich are poor in.

There are people who are poor now although they always weren't. Our great society, as it is called, has derpived them of their means to a better life in its race to be the best.

There are poor people who won't be poor for long, although their methods of raising themselves from the depths of poverty is usually one only of raising the finances, not the character.

There are poor people on every corner, on the self same corners as the rich. There are poor people everywhere, despite the fact that all men are created equal. What happens between creation and this world to unequalize them?

In conclusion, all I can do is return to the question: Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States? Why? I really don't know.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

The factors we have studied in this course are so numerous and varied as to why there is poverty in a society such as ours that it would be quite the task to enumerate them. I really don't think that there is one pat answer to the above question that could be applicable to all, or even most cases.

The facet of poverty which bothers me most is not that it exists, bug that it still exists now and will probably continue to exist for some time to come. People just aren't aware, either intentionally or through white-washed rationalizations (e.g. the poor are the happiest people; they deserve their lot; they're shiftless, etc.) that such squalor and misery exists in such a land of plenty.

Most people too, I now believe, tend to think of the poor, if they do at all, in terms of a middle class people who are merely down on their luck, who were once middle class, and who would like to again be middle class, and who have the same middle class values and aspirations as their more fortunate counterparts. I doubt that many people see poverty as the subculture it has become. I doubt too that many people realize that living in a subculture of this type entails living a life of misery, emotional as well as physical.

If people could be made aware, deeply aware, of the conditions of poverty, that more might be done to alleviate the problem. If a course such as this one could reach the majority of people in a position to aid the indigent, I tendto think that something might be done about the problem. I realize well, now, how enormous a task it would be to eradicate poverty, but if enough people were concerned, and enough people cared as they only can with knowledge of the problem, there may come a time when the vicious circle of poverty will be demolished.

In answer to the original question, all I can do by way of an answer is state that which I feel: Greater public awareness and concern must be brought about before poverty can be overcome. A course such as this was, I feel, a guiding light.

CROMARTIE, LINDA

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U.S.A.:

The words, rich and poor, are used to compare two levels, whether economical, intellectual, or cultural. In order to compare two levels, one level must be inferior to the other or at least different enough to be branded inferior. For this reason there are no rich people unless there are poor people, just as there are no beautiful ones unless there are ugly ones.

If about forty-seven percent of thepopulation in the United States was made up only of millionaires, and the other fifty-three percent was composed of people on what is now the upper-middle class level, the latter group would be branded as the poor ones. Even if there were no tenements, no delinquency, no starvation, or no unemployment, the latter group would be thepoor ones. Three of the main reasons, I think, are fate, difference in level of intelligence, and value of one's services.

Fate can determine, or influence what opportunity is offered to whom at the right time. Many times, one gets on top simply due to his luck.

The level of intelligence of each person determines the limit to his abilities. The limit to one's abilities will determine what service a person performs in order to make a living. The value of his service as decided by others in his society is an important factor in determining what compensation he gets for his service. Naturally, those who can perform more valuable or more unique services progress faster or get greater compensation than does another with less ability. This rate of progression becomes the dividing line between the rich and the poor.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

Poor people, people with inadequate food, clothes, and shelter, form a minority group. This group of people is undknown to many members of the upper classes, and they are not needed in the American society; therefore, they are left out.

The capitalist system is one which functions well without poor people. They do not consume many good, since they have not the money to buy them. Capitalism is a system in which competition is great and the main goal is to obtain as much for oneself as one can. In this kind of system it is evitable that out of the one hundred ninety-six million people, there will be some who, because of undisciplined competition, will get nothing.

The fact that some people get nothing, no job, no education, no luxuries, is unpleasant - to the few who know about it. Thus, they rationalize it or they explain it away. This rationalization, by members of the upper classes, is an attempt to justify the existence of poverty and a social system which will not allow the elimination of poverty. These very people are the ones who resist social change or change of the present system.

Since the poor form a minority group, they can not iniate a change

CROMARTIE, LINDA - cont'd.

effectively. The effort to change the system is repressed by the upper classes.

This repression of effort causes frustration which builds up until it explodes in the form of a riot, or crime wave. But, the explosion is capped by use of police force to deep the poor under control.

Having no control or influence on what's done in the country, and being controlled by those who influence what goes on adds to the helplessness of the poor. They are poor partly because they have no power in the government, so that they are unable to influence legislature for their benefit. No interest group is represented or formed by the poor.

Since they cannot change or even influence any of the functions of the system, the poor are just left without hope. Thus, many of them feel that there is just no use; they lose all motivation.

In summary, a few of the reasons that poverty exists in this rich society are that the poor lack motivation, that they have no power to change the system so that they will benefit, that their efforts to improve their conditions are repressed by the upper classes, and that unlimited competition encourages selfishness and lack of concern for other people.

There are many other factors which help to make poverty grow in this rich society. A combination of sociological, psychological, political and economic factors bring about and perpetuate poverty in this rich society - the richest society in the world.

DORSEY, ELEANOR

ESSAY # 1

Poverty is not the invention of the rich society in the United States. Since the beginnings of man's social organization, material goods have been unequally distributed. And assuming that our society is not a radical departure from the past, one should go back and find the reasons for this initial unequal distribution to understand the basis of present day poverty in our affluent society.

The question posed here, however, is more specific than just why is there poverty. The question is rather: why is there still poverty? One of the answers would again be a reference to history. Probably people and social organizations function in much the same way that they have all through history. The forces causing poverty in the Middle Ages, therefore, are still causing poverty today.

Differences in man's mental and physical capabilities, caused in turn by hereditary and environmental facotrs, are one reason for the disparities in man's wealth. Even with sufficient ability however, some people lack the iniative or the opportunity to make use of them. And, by contrast, some seemingly incapable people manage to be rich just through chance or luck. Influences other than just the potential in a man, therefore, determine his material wealth. His place in society, his society, his place in history, his personal life, and many other involved facets of his life are important.

Even considering all these complexities, we still have not determined why the forces of poverty have not been broken by the incredible wealth of the United States. First we must ascertain that they have not, in fact, been broken. Afterall, few people are starving, obviously, standards have changed.

ESSAY # 2

Our society today is one of abundance: we have overcome the problem of scarcity which limited us for so long. Thus we have the ability and resources to give everyone in the United States a decent living, but, in fact, one-fourth of the population is poor. The only possible reason for the perpetuation of poverty in a rich society like the U. S. is a lack of concern on the part of the three-quarters of the population who have "made it". The causes for this apathy are thus the causes of poverty.

With the modification and ending of the free enterprise system in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, a capitalistic ideology appeared which we still believe today to be an accurate description of our economy. The ideas of a Darwinian struggle for survival of the fittest in a competitive system within which everyone must work and produce or starve - these ideas are at the base of our concept of our economic system. Because of them, we feel that it is every man for himself, that we cannot take care of the other guy because we have to watch out for ourselves. The growing welfare and social security programs counteract this selfishness to some extent, but many people are not reached by these programs or are not helped by them.

One large factor for people not caring aboutthe poor is that, as Harrington says, the poor are the invisible other America. Most people are not aware of the defree or extent of poverty in this country. But the fact that we can overlook one-quarter of the population shows that these people make little difference in the functioning of society. In fact, our economic system does not need the poor to operate, and if people really cared about the poor, the economy could not function as it does.

The people who run the economy, therefore, those with a vested interest in the status quo, try consciously or unconsciously to distract attention from the poor. These are the people who control the mass media to a large degree and make sure that we don't hear very much about poverty. They stimulate consumption through advertising and brainwashing and help perpetuate our narrow self-concern.

The educational system also serves to help the status quo. The prupose of education today is to make us able to function in the economy, in other words, to make us indifferent to social problems like poverty. Education sets us up as contributing members of our social and economic class and tries to keep us that way.

Class, itself, is another factor restricting awareness. Through the process of socialization, we adopt the norms and goals of a certain group in society. To keep the security of this group, we must conform to it's rules and direct our whole lives around it. Thus the restrictions of class result in introverted, selfish people aware and concerned only with their own group.

The conformity of the classes is similar to the uniformity of the mass society we are approaching. Automation, bureaucracy, and standardization turns people into things and statistics. We loose the sense of being human, loose our individuality, and loose our awareness. We are no longer free to be ourselves or free to know what is really happening in this country. The necrophilous tendencies caused by industrialization and automation makes us more concerned with death than with life and living people, such as the poor.

Even if, through some flaw in the system, we should become aware of and concerned with the problem of poverty, several things prevent our doing anything significant to help. The U. S. government is controlled by different interest groups, all of which lobby for their own benefits. Congress is not representative of the country because of unequal districting and lack of suffrage, for example, for the Negroes in the South. Congress is, therefore, conservative and stagnant, unwilling and unable to effect real reform.

What is more, we tend to look for simplified solutions to the problem when we approach it. Give them education, or give them jobs, or give them money, we say. But we don't stop to consider that many interacting factors influence the poor's position and must all be considered. Perhaps the lack of development of social sciences is one of the causes of this naivete.

Basically, poverty exists in the U. S. because people are not aware and people don't care.

DUGGAN, JULIE

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U. S. A.?

The basic reason that there are poor people in a rich society, I think, is that ever since the beginning of time, there have been men who lead and men who will follow. Men who are mentally superior to their neighbors naturally will gain some measure of their respect provided that they use what abilities they have. In early times an intelligent caveman undoubtedly thought first of fashioning weapons out of metal instead of stones. In those days, of course, on the small-scale level of primitive society (I don't even knowif one may call it a society), man probably did not use this knowledge and superiority to the disadvantage or exploitation of his neighbors, but rather share it with him. But in our society which is so materialistc and complex, the natural leaders and men of superior ability who wish to attain wealth can do it without too much difficulty, leaving the great masses who do not have their exceptional character, far behind. This often is done at the price of exploiting poorer people, who, it seems, just get poorer and more numerous.

I really know nothing at all about this question, only that it seems that poverty in our country seems to be something that is past, present, and to come, something that one hardly tries to suggest a solution to because one does not know exactly what to solve.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U. S. A.?

There are poor people in a rich society like the U. S. A. because for seventeen years, seven months, two weeks, and six days it never occurred to me to wonder why there *are* poor people in a rich society like ours. I had experienced *relative* poverty, but I never let myself wonder about *absolute* poverty and the poor people. This is why, as Michael Harrington says, the poor are *hidden*. We don't want to let ourselves think about them - we're too busy relating *our* status to that of the rest of our community.

Juvenal said that "the tragedy of poverty is that it makes men utterly ridiculous." This is true, but he was not living in our society. Besides the fact that it makes men ridiculous, in our society poverty is a tragedy because it is *so unnecessary*. We are living in such an affluent society that no one should be denied the minimum standards of housing, food, etc. But they are denied them; 50,000,000 people are denied them because people just don't care. They regard the poor as lazy and themselves as having achieved whatever they have by dint of their hard work. They don't know about the poor - they never see them. (And even if the poor were lazy and it were their own fault that they were impoverished - what of their children? Like the descendants of the P ycheons, are they to suffer for the sins of their fathers?) This is directly a result of the economic system which places such a high premium on achievment, pecuniary and material achievement. "Since money is the highest divinity around us, even though we have not yet put up an altar to cash, there will soon be a temple to money." Success, at any cost to anyone else, must be assured, but it is only those people who already have middle class values that are going to achieve or at least have a chance of achieving success as we see it.

And the poor are not equal to the other people in our country. Equality should not be measured in IQ (middle class culture tests) tests - no men have the same abilities. Equality should not be measured by where one lives or what color he is - but it is. There is no equality of opportunity in our country.

There is poverty then because everyone who has any money at all cares only about making more; because those who have the power (financial and political) to alleviate the lot of the poor do not care about the poor, only about themselves; because we hide the poor so we don't have to think about them, rather than do anything to help them.

There are poor people in our society because in a week I'll probably have forgotten all about poverty and poor people. There is nothing I alone can do, anyway, to change their lot, and I'll be going back to where money and material success are all that count.

DUNSFORD, KATHRYN

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U. S. A.?

The U. S. is one of the wealthier nations, if not the wealthiest on the earth, yet behind her affluent and oppulent "cloak" there exists another America.

The members of this "hidden society" are not only quartered in the crowded cities but the wide, rolling, rural areas. They differ in age, race, and religion, but all have the same problem - poverty.

Various ways and means have been established to rectify this problem - through poverty programs in urban and rural areas etc. but none as of yet, have been too successful.

Sometimes this may lead me to think well what's wrong with these people - the underprivileged ones - when so much money has been set aside to help them - don't they want to uplift themselves - to rise above their present state. Upon thinking about it deeply I realize, that one of the major problems in attempting to work with such people must be that they have more than a material lack - but often an educational one. The "old man" on the city street corner is left jobless because his farmer job can now be done by a machine and he lacks the education to step up to another one.

People of certain ethnic groups seem to be... (Time)

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

The poor people or low class in the United States of America are "invisible" to the middle and upper classes. One may ride through the "other side of town" and see the dingy, dilapidated shacks the poor, unkempt children sitting on the steps and feel bad for them but then keep on driving to his nice home in "suburbia". He could drive out to the beautiful countryside and not see behind the mask of nature the impoverished, stricken ones.

Before taking this course I didn't conceive of the complexity of this question. If some one has asked me "Why are there poor in the United States of America" my answer probably would have been, "because they have no money". There are just so many reasons and factors keeping them "down" in their state.

Naturally, because of their economic position they are "manipulated" by society. It almost seems as if it needs them to do it's dirty work. Who else would pick the strawberries for $ 1.00 a day?

Things which were intended for the benefit of all have even hindered their chances of climbing. Machines were invented to speed up production, as a result they put many people out of work. Urban Renewal in many large cities of the United States in an effort to eradicate the slums has madethem more invisible as well as in many cases displaced and homeless.

Their lack of education certainly serves to keep them down. They may have schools in their districts but the funds alloted from Federal, State and Municipal means often go to the multi-million structures four districts away, the place where the middle class families' children are educated. As a result of their educational deprivation a larger part of them have low intelligent quotients.

The poor are greatly unorganized politically. They have few lobbyists in Congress to get bills passed in their favor and benefit.

Because of all these various things their also dejected and demoralized attitudes towards society.

One thing that is most impostant for Americans - the "fortunate" ones is to become aware, awakened to the problems of them. Although this has been done to some degree through such organizations as Head Start, Vista, etc. there are still many indigents in the society.

One thing many of us have gotten from this course is a desire to help, we are oftenttimes "fired" with the will to do so. But, even as we realize our inadequacy right now, at least, even when we go home to our middle class security, we have the feeling, the awareness that is probably needed to "help" or to begin to any way.

FINKELSTEIN, MARK

Essay 1

The United STates, taken as a whole, is the richest nation in the world today. It is, perhaps, the richest hation in the earth's history. Yet, within this affluent society, there exists a very substantial number of people whose income, or more directly, whose standard of living is below that which is generally regarded as adequate.

The question is Why are there poor people? The question is obviously quite complex.

I believe much of the problem centers around education. By education, I mean not only booklearning, but also enlightenment. To the indigent Negro, for example, what help in escaping poverty would an education be if his prospective employer is an unenlightened person who does not believe that any Negro, no matter how educated, is capable of doing responsible work.

Poverty has been defined as not only an emply breadbox, but also as a state of mind. Poor people have been convinced, probably with some justification, that the future can bring no relief, and that the wonderful American of plenty for all is not their America. Unable to escape from a rut that has entrapped a fmaily or a community for generations, this anachronism of poverty is sustained. (time)

Essay 2

At the outset, I would like to say that I believe that it is impossible to answer the question in any true sense. However, I will attempt to briefly note some of my beliefs.

I believe that the fundamental cause of this poverty situation must be attributed to our economic system.

By its very nature, it creats a society that is indifferent, even hostile, to the wants and needs of many of its people. THe very fact that our society centers around eocnomics is revealing. WE, as a group, have no goals. As individuals in the open market, our main objective is material success. This is a game in which millions are doomed to lose.

Other factors, such as ones of power, are not basic to the question, but are important only as a means of insuring that the poor people will remain in their reduced condition.

I believe that our system must be changed to take the emphasis away from production and shift it to people. WE must have a set of goals, and a system that will be a servant to its members, and not their master.

BURST, BARBARA

Essay 1

Among the manyfactors that contribute to creating poor people in the midst of a rich society are lack of education, laziness, and ignorance.

Lack of education may result from a family need for financial help forcing the individual to quit school, or the individual may drop out becuase of poor grades. In either case the labor market is confronted with unskilled labor. THere is little opportunity for advancement above the minimum wage working in a factory assemply line, for example, thus the family dependent upon this person will most likely be in the lower economic brackets.

While lack of education at times is unavoidable, laziness is not. 1There are people whose jobs, probably involving unskilled labor, pay little more than relief checks, so why should they work? Working, they fall into the poverty area and not working they do the same.

Ignorance results indirectly from lack of education and definitely not from laziness. A prime example of ignorance is in Appalachia where for generations people have mined coal and suddenly there is no more national need. I wondered why the people just did not leave the area, but apparently they are unaware of conditions in other part s of the country. Their parents have mined and that's all they know. (time)

Essay 2

There are many reasons why there are poor people in a rich society like the Unted States. Economically, there is an unfair distribution of capital. THis is exemplified by the industries of the country. THere are about 500 really large controloing companies which net almost 3/4 of the profits. Becuase they earn this disproportionate amount of money, they are a powerful lobby in Congress. Their influence is reflected in the legislation passed - none of it substantially benefits the poor because they are afraid of upsetting their position on top by allowing the poor to rise.

This continual suppression of the poor by the controlling (added note: If the poor could unite to bargain collectively as a group they would be perhaps an equally important lobby because they do comprise almost 1/3 of the population.) third is done bery subtlely - yet it has succeeded in givin g the poor a feeling of utter hopelessness or fatalism. They feel they can never beat the system so why try.

Often times the children are required to quit school and get a job to help out at home. THis lack of education only perpetuates their station and limits their opportunities for advancement in employment. Even if a Negro completes college, he only earns a salary comprable to a while who has graduated from the eighth grade. Knowing this, perhaps their resignment to life and lack of motivation can be understood.

The most disconderting fact is that the economy can function perfeclty without looking at the problem of the poor at all. Business doesn't need the poor as consumers, or as unskilled labor.

GILLIGAN, WILLIAM

Essay #1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U.S.A.?

The first task arising from the priginal question is what are poor people? and what is a rich society?

A poor person is one who is both economically and socially far below the average position of the rest of his countrymen. A rich society is one with a high living standard, having many modern conveniences and a leisure periodwhich is equal to or greater than the period required to earn a living.

There are several reasons for the existance of poor people in an affluent society. Lack of education, lack of ability, the social scale, which places one person below another and while it may not force them to remain in one station it does not help them to rise socially, no desire to obtain anything above a bare existence, and also a basic feeling of what's the use of trying. The chief reason for the continued existance of poor people in a society like our own is that poverty and poorness propegate themselves generation after generation, a cycle that can not be changed from within, but that must be altered by outside forces acting on it.

Today in our society there are more causes for poor people than there were at almost any other period. IN colonial America there was always land and with it opportunity. In 1890, this means of changing one's position began to close and the generations which followed where to become the poor people in our society today. Each generation increasing its (time up)

Essay #2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States of America?

There are poor people in a rich society like the United States because most people seem to be more interested in analyzing the question rather tha n trying to eliminate the problem. However, since that is a sdifferent issue I will ignore it partially, but it can not be ignored completely.

After six weeks of this course I feel a little ridiculous trying to answer a question like this, but I will try anyway. I think that economi and sociological conditions are the main reasons that poverty exists and I might even say that it is all sociological, that is poverty is an inherent part of our society as it is structured today. Not that we need poverty to exist or that people, on the whole, think poverty is necessary; its just that we have values and norms which cause poverty to exist and any attempt to end poverty with "charity" is like spitting on a raging fire to put it out. Mr. Dowd has said that capitalism - American capitalism - has led people to have

GILLIGAN, WILLIAM (con't)

efficiency as a goal, we won't even admit that this is true and we profess humanistic goals - love for our fellow man, equality, and democracy, but these things just don't work in a society whose highest goal is efficiency.

We've talked alot about the power structure, how the poor don't have political power to change conditions, because they don't have the economic power to get political power, do you read all these things. Also we said that poor people lack education, that they don't have a strong motivation. Then Maccoby comes out with how really abnormally everyone is, its just that there abnormally in the same way and so can't see. But all these are just relatively minor points, the main thing people don't really care that their are poor they can't even belief that something is wrong with the system "nice guy" and so poverty will continue to exist even if we do educate the poor - because its the rich middle ("relatively rich", complacent, blind) class that has to be educated.

In conclusion I would like to say that no matter how bad our system is the others~~s~~ are so much worse (paraphrase) I think even yet. Still I don't think that this is any reason not to change it. (drawing of American flag)

Good luck next year in Italy. I think this was a good course, and I think this system can be changed and I think this course is a good indication that it can be and everyone who wants change is not Pink. Jim didn't come to class. I did. Where's Jim. I think this paper is important and I think it is important to be serious, however being humanistic I have decided to interject a little humor and frivolity.

GLOVER, DIANA

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U. S. A.?

First of all, I believe that I should define my definition of poor people. To me, this does not necessarily apply to the economic background. Whether or not you have money which you able to spend, or lots of property and security, this does not directly influence one's position as being rich or poor. In defining this state or situation I believe that it is important to consider things such as health, physically and mentally. A person with a limited education is poor in a sense and so are those with set and limitedideas who have no time for others and their ideas. The United States society is considered rich as a result of it's economical, political, and social wealth. As individuals, mentally sound people is also an important factor. On the basis of my own personal definition of poor people I can attempt to answer the question. Those lacking an education is an example of poor people. The reasons for this lack of education are many. In some cases inadequate schools which did not inspire the people caussed them to drop it seeking better things; in some places educational facilities were very limited; also a couple of generations ago the emphasis not placed on education was not present. Often due to unending cycle where people weren't able to get decent jobs took low payings ones which were not enough to pay for higher education which in turn was needed for a good job.

I also believe that a person limited in ideas and stuck to their own beliefs and ideas are indeed poor when this limits their acceptance of others and their ideas.

Also there exists poor people in the rich society of the United States because of their own laziness. Some believe they should receive benefits handed to them on a silver platter. The world owes them a living so why should they try to better themselves and do something with their life. They are given a chance to help themselves but they don't.

As a conclusion for now, I believe there are many reasons for poor people in a rich society and that these reasons are based on the definition of poor as interpreted by the one answering the question.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

In first considering the answer to the question I just stated education and lack of money. I still think so but under different circumstances. As far as education is concerned, I mean formal education which is needed to rise to any status level. Everything, just about, centers on one's education. (Especially jobs). Besides lacking in the formal education, there are other things. I believe the poor should be allowed to discover what is actual, the truth, the beauty around us, and different everyday things which we appreciate without realizing the value and which can not be categorized as book learning. Seeing where the poor are living below decent living standards where there is over-crowding in a place which is not fit for living in, where there isn't enough money to buy the needs for survival such as food, clothing and shelter, one must agree that same form of income which will help to obtain these things is needed.

In looking at the operation of our government, it has been brought to my attention that the poor people of the United States are not actually represented. If they were fully represented one might see a chance of more federal legislation which would and could prove to be profitable.

As a group the poor people of the United States should unite. Together if they make an attempt to demand help or what is due they might succeed. But as individuals the problem can not be solved.

The poor people have such feelings of lowliness, despair, rejection, I'm stuck here, etc. which they find hard to rise above.

The existence of the poor in the U. S. can also be associated with the economic system of the U. S. capitalism is based on competition. Often it is said that everyone should be on a "equal level" to some extent financially but as long as there is competition someone will always have to remain on the bottom or below someone else.

The invisibility of the poor is also a factor. Many of the poor drive fine cars and dress just like others (as a result of mass-production this is fairly easy to do. This invisibility is like a screen and is therefore not seen by others.

Going back to education, often, just vacational training will help the poor to secure a decent job or at least supply some form of income.

I know there are many reasons for the existence of the poor. Many of the reasons I do not know and understand.

I can truly say that I have learned somethings about the poor and really began to realize the situation. It is also a situation which I have never really thought about until this course.

such as food, clothing and shelter, one must agree that same form of income which will help to obtain these things is needed.

In looking at the operation of our government, it has been brought to my attention that the poor people of the United States are not actually represented. If they were fully represented one might see a chance of more federal legislation which would and could prove to be profitable.

As a group the poor people of the United States should unite. Together if they make an attempt to demand help or what is due they might succeed. But as individuals the problem can not be solved.

The poor people have such feelings of lowliness, despair, rejection, I'm stuck here, etc. which they find hard to rise above.

The existence of the poor in the U. S. can also be associated with the economic system of the U. S. capitalism is based on c ompetition. Often it is said that everyone should be on a "equal level" to some extent financially but as long as there is competition someone will always have to remain on the bottom or below someone else.

The invisibility of the poor is also a factor. Many of the poor drive fine cars and dress just like others (as a result of mass-production this is fairly easy to do. This invisibility is like a screen and is therefore not seen by others.

Going back to education, often, just vacational training will help the poor to secure a decent job or at least supply some form of income.

I know there are many reasons for the existence of the poor. Many of the reasons I do not know and understand.

I can truly say that I have learned somethings about the poor and really began to realize the situation. It is also a situation which I have never really thought about until this course.

GOODWIN, STEPHEN

ESSAY # 1

There are poor people in the U. S. for a diversity of reasons. The main reason I feel is the moral fiber in each individual that directs and controls his or her life.

Men of Good Intentions by Blair and The Power in Washington by Carter reveal the affects laws and lawmakers have on society. The various complexities of Washington, D. C. is further complicated by the supreme law of the land which was written several hundred years ago. Carter stresses the weaknesses and the strengths of the unwritten and written laws presently incorporated in the U. S. Constitution today. I feel the President's programs aimed at poverty gain tremendous impetus from the unwritten laws of our country. Blair's conclusion was that the corruption and efficiency during Grant's and Harding's administration is still rampant in the Johnson Administration, thus hindering his Great Society program. I feel this is especially true because of my affiliation with Ponica Democratic Club, during the primaries in New York City last week. I was employed as a news reporter to work there. Through many sans cesse questions on politics I discovered several dirty tricks that are still being employed today on the City and State levels.

The economics of the situation is clearly demonstrated by Operation Head Start and the job program. These programs are designed to escalate the present educational trend in America and train people in new skills replaced by automation. The major conflict in this comes through prolonged periods of time and weak administrative procedures. They don't coincide as intended.

ESSAY # 2

Focusing the question of why there are poor people in rich society to the citizens of Harlem one comes to realize their primary deficiency lies in the economic institutions that canvas their community.

The economic crisis in Harlem can be separated into two distinct schools of thought. The most important is that Negroes constituted 7½ per cent of the population that live in poor housing develppments due to untrained positions in jobs and little educational advancement. This position can be supported by Miller's Rich Man, Poor Man where [illegible] more statistical data confirms this point. The other school deals with Keynes economics in our society. To establish stabilized competitive market among the poor would be virtually impossible because of the spectrum income levels that are characteristic of a subsistence level of living.

GRANT, MARILYNN

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U. S. A.?

Before I begin to answer this question I feel it is necessary to establish some basis of what we mean by poor people. In every society there are classe levels of economic standing. By poor people then I wish to refer to these who suffer from the lack of basic necessities - food, shelter, clothing.

The first reason which comes to my mind when asked this question if the lack of education. Education has become a sifting device for almost all jobs. A person is hired because of theeducation he has received and payed (to some extent) according. Therefore a basic step toward fighting poverty (I did not follow the differentiation made by Mr. Dowd - poverty - poor people) would be to educated the poor that they may attain better jobs and subsequently receive more pay.

Another cause of poverty which follows from my previous cause is something that is created by the society itself - discrimination. True we live in a democracy but nevertheless the fact of discrimination is very real. Monority groups are not always able to receive an education above the secondary level. Education itself involves money. How is an uneducated minority group going to be able to educated his children if he is discriminated against.

As you can see this becomes a vicious circle. A family is unable to receive a good job because of lack of education and race, creed, or color and subsequently is unable to educate their children.

This is where the government plays their part is fighting poverty. Poverty exists or is aided to a great extent by what the government does.

Finally in the causes of poverty that I'd like to mention is lack of interest for betterment. "Where there is a will there is a way." Poor people must desire a better way of life. People are there to help them and they must realize this and take advantage of it. It is not always easy but in a society like ours it is more possible (I believe) than ever before.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U. S.?

This is a question which I believe can be correctly answered. The reason why there are poor people in a rich society like the U. S. is a complex of interlocking economical, sociological, historical, and sociological factors.

In our society there are many kinds of poor.

1) Poverty among minority groups. A good percentage of our poor are foreigners (Mexican, Puerto Rican) who are discriminated against because of their nationality. They came to this country relatively poor, frequently unskilled, or educated and unfamiliar with American language and customs. Thus they begin at the bottom of our system. Prejudice against the race in general and society does not make it possible for them to elevate themselves.

This is true of the American Negro who has been in the country much longer, however is only recently making real progress in our system.

GRANT, MARILYNN - cont'd.

Society characterizes a minority group because of the way our system forces them to live. And it refuses to allow the upward movement of this group. Thus, low income, poor living conditions, lack of money to educate family, low income job, low income.

Twenty five percent of American poor are Negro. Because the American Negro has a past history of slavery in our country - which the white man subjected him to. And because his national traits - mainly the color of his skin have made it harder tnd impossible to separate completely from his race.

Seventy-five percent of American poor, however, are white. The cycle is much the same except they are not being held back by racial or national discrimination. However these people are in a "rut". Their lives seem hopeless and apathy results. They lack the motivation to escape their "plight". White poor do not organize for their own betterment.

The poor cannot help themselves - so we must help them. Many programs have been initiated to help the economically poor and many have failed. The greatest problem of these people is psychological, thus our help should be gearedto this.

In our American society everything is based on competition. To help the poor we must be sincerely interested in their problem, understand them and be willing to give of themselves. This is a lot to ask of a society who is not even conscious of her poor.

I believe that the cuases of poverty are many, however the reason why poverty still exists is indifference on the part of our affluent society to help. Our lives are planned even before we are born to partake in the mad world of competitive struggle to the top of the ladder.

If only more Americans would become aware of this grave problem and subsequently sincerely concerned and willing to do something about it theproblem of today's poor would be tomorrow non-existent.

GRAYSON, MARK

ESSAY # 1

There are too many projections in my mind to attempt a logical presentation of the question "Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U. S. A.?" As fragments or ideas come forward, I will explain their value.

First, a differentiation must be made between the question of poverty as a generalization and poor people in particular singling out the individual.

The world has become too complex and automated for the general utility of the individual. In an age wherever leading scientists can master only specific fields, it is difficult for the more common person to fit into society. People can no longer get adequate jobs if they are not educated, both in the classical and system disciplines.

For many, simple willingness is no longer adequate. The well known picture of the family in the "Grapes of Wrath" who offer their bodies for manual labor only to find a lack of jobs is a case in point.

This example of the problem during the Depression still exists in many places and yet cannot be maintained completely.

My firm belief is that anyone with a satisfactory education can find employment in the present economic and social system if he wishes. Often, the conflict arises when the society he seeks is not available and the present one does not satisfy him.

"What is a poor person?" is probably a key issue I should previously have established. Jewish tradition tells of two farmer brothers - one has little financial acquisitions but a loving wife and happy family while the other is rich in material wealth but lacks a fmmily or friends. One night the wealthy one moves some of his grain to the other's field. He believes he owes something to his brother because he has so much more riches. The next day, the other brother discovers the grain and that night he returns it to the first man after adding some extra grain to it. When the wealthy brother disvovers this the next day he approaches his brother and asks why he did not accept the grain. The other replies that his warm family life makes him far richer and satisfied that mere wealth could ever bring.

The idea of this story is the duality of man's goals: material and personal desires.

When these are joined, the question is easy but when they conflict the question must go far deeper. (Time)

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U. S.?'

The key to the problem of poor people in a rich society is environment. As I mentioned in my term paper, the poverty cycle is difficult to break. "The Cool World" a movie we saw illustrates the difficulty. For purposes of discussion, I will

GRAYSON, MARK - cont'd.

define those poor people I am considering as "the other America", Harrington's term. Contrast the attempts of the teacher to show historical background to his ninth grade calss with the world of the gang in it's room. This gap is impenetrable for many of the inner city residents in the U. S.

Our educational system with all its formality and overcrowding just cannot reach these kids. The normally upwardly mobile "mainstream of American life" is closed to these children, for most of them, because of their early background. Unless this background of absolute poverty, squalidness, and lack of hope can be changed, these kids will continue the poverty cycle for their area.

Migtant workers and rural poor also tend to suffer from the same problems and like those of the inner city, seldom change from the ways of their parents.

Harrington claims that the poor are hidden. This is quite true. Looking at "Sixteen in Webster Groves" I remember one kid who said he didn't realize people in the U. S. lived so poorly until he passed through a slum in St. Louis. Placed in slums, on the migrant circuit, or in the rural areas, these poor people just don't come through as reality to those of the suburbias and nice parts of the cities throughout the nation.

Legislation is difficult to pass and generate support for in the U. S. Most people do not want to admit there may be some things wrong with the system. When Prof. Dowd says there are more and more poor people in the "Affluent Society" I wonder if this means that the percentage is greater or it is just a natural increase due to population expansion. Either way, it shows we have a long way until we can be satisfied with our system.

It seems so obvious to me that it is easy to get a job now for money and to earn a satisfactory living so I can support a family and my own needs in the future. And yet it is the opposite, as I now realize, with the kids from the slums. They would not know where to look for a decent job and do not have the acquired knowledge to maintain it.

If all support for me in the world ended tonight (parents, relatives, friends) I could still live a productive, meaningful life. Yet this does not end the situation by saying the poor lack initiative. If I had the same environment they grew up in I might have the same problems. This is a part of macroscopic view.

A microscopic view would be completely different in perspective. A good break and real initiative can help someone rise out of this cycle i.e. basketball player, kid going to college who depended on Blood to live in this jungle society until he could get out. But while this may help in individual cases and it does, it will not solve the problem.

We must get these people to somehow relate with "this here America" or the issue will never be solved.

Still, I feel that the single individual can overcome a poor environment through real effort. Opportunities abound. (See "Look" magazine this issue Aug. or Sept.) With it's description of the NAM efforts to help the individual who wants to rise above his environment. The real issue is that this approach will not solve the problem for large numbers of poor people

HALL, PATRICIA

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U.S.A.?

That question is about as difficult to give a definite answer to as the famous question - "which came first - the hen or the egg?" I believe that the reason that it is difficult to answer is because there are so many different types of poor people in the U. S. By that I mean that every person is an individual and the factors which may have been the cause of one person's poverty, may not have been the cause of another person's poverty. The question is also difficult to answer because it raises the problem - "Exactly who is poor?" Many people believe that even a poor person in the United States would be considered well-to-do in another country. But in an attempt to answer this question, I will have to draw a line and say that perhaps a poor person is one who earns less than $ 3000 per year. Maybe earlier, people would have thought that $ 3000 was a lot but now it's not. Jobs are becoming scarcer for those who have a law degree of education.

Lack of education is perhaps the greatest reason for poverty. People who are uneducated, can't find good all year jobs ; thus, they can't afford college or some other form of higher education for their children. This leaves their children to grow-up exactly as their parents - poor. This seems to be like a never ending cycle which can only be broken by means of higher education.

However, some are poor because of prejudice.

ESSAY #2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U.S.?

When I first answered this question, I believed that people were poor because they lacked the proper education and thus, weren't able to get decent jobs. Now I realize that the answer is much more complicated. There are so many factors involved.

One factor is the American middle-class. These are the people who could help the poor more than anyone because: (A) Some of them were poor once and were able to get out (B) They are the majority of Americans. Yet, among the middle class, there is a tremendous display of apathy towards the poor.

Perhaps one reason for this apathy is that the middle class, knowing that they have the necessities of life and many of the luxuries just decided that they don't care at all about anyoneelse. They know that they have a new T.V. and a secure job; therefore, they say to themselves, "Why worry about the poor? I've got my own problems."

Another reason for the apathy of the middle class is that they are naive. They don't know that poor people exist. They rationalize and say that the poor in the U.S. would be considered rich in another society; therefore, there are no poor. If these middle class people do finally recognize that there are "less fortunate" people, they further rationalize and say, "Oh, but they're really happy. They're close to Nature." Because of this apathy, the poor remain poor.

(con't next page)

HALL, PATRICIA (con't.)

Another reason we still have poor people in the U.S. is that many Americans are strict conformists. No one is willing to take that big step to help the poor. The educational system in the U.S. is partially to blame. All during school, a child is taught how to "get ahead". This means getting the right job, the right money and not rocking the boat. However, many are hesitant to take that big step to help the poor because they don't want to be labeled a kook, an odd-ball or a communist. Everyone has a basic need for group identification and it takes alot of courage to be an individual.

Also, the way our national politics are run, a program to help the poor would have to be second to a program to change our political system. The way things are now, the President can't do anything along; he needs the help of Congress. So far, Congress has shyed away from much social legislature and has passed bills appropriating the war and new super highways.

Many people think that they can have effective legilation passed through their political party. However, they don't know that they are being manipulated by this party.

I don't mean to sound pessimistic. I think that something can be done to eliminate poverty. First of all, the American people need a greater awareness of this problem. Secondly, the educational system should be revised to teach greater individuality (such as the Monteasere schools.)

HORECKER, LINDA

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

It is difficult to arrive at an answer to the question of why poverty exists. Most existing answers are either too general or too specific. Even these unsatisfactory solutions are few and far between, for in the United States today, poverty is a question which is seldom considered to any greater extent than the giving of token aid from several different organizations.

When attempting tofind an answer to why poverty exists or a satisfactory method of alleviating it a great difficulty lies in the many aspects from which this problem can be attacked. When answers are found to the sociological, political, economical and psycological problems an attempt can be made to solve the problem as a whole.

At this point I can not offer a personal opinion as to why poverty exists in the United States other than simply saying that owing to the sociological and economic evolution of our society there has always been a certain group, usually a minority, who have, for certain psycological and perhaps political reasons, either chosen or been forced to exist in a state of poverty, under our standard of living. Because the underlying reasons for their plight are not often clear even to themselves a blanket solution is that much more difficult to discover.

I feel that the most important aspect to consider when probing this problem isthat the core of the problem centers on individuals. Each individual affected by poverty reacts in a completely different way. Perhaps because of this the best way to attempt to find an answer to the poverty problem is to deal with the people themselves and study more actual existing problems than optomistic theories that offer impractical solutions.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in the United States?

Poverty may be examined from four different viewpoints, sociological, psychological, economic and political. Each is as important as the other and each must be considered in order to make a thorough study of why poverty exists in our society.

The main social factor which must be considered is the racial makeup of the poor minority. Out of the 50 million poor in the U. S. the majority are Negro. However, there are also many white poor who, like the Negro, are submerged in poverty finding it a vicious cycle impossible to escape. Unable to cope with our middle calss orientated society, these people are defeated before the start and, in many cases, unintentionally adopt a defeatist outlook.

The social and psychological aspects of poverty are very closely related. It is the effect of our middle class values that cause us to overlook poverty and this "invisibility" of the poor is detrimental to their progress. There is agreat barrier between the poor and the rest of society and in most cases this barrier can not be broken by empathy or pity.

Of course, the most obvious reasons why poverty exists are economic.

HORECKER, LINDA - cont'd.

The poor suffer an inability to secure jobs and therefore suffer financially. In the majority of poor communities the prices are raised considerably causing the poor to receive a completely warped (which it is) view of our economy. This inability to earn money can basically be traced back to a lack of education, however, many other conditions must be considered such as the unequal opportunity of the Negro in the North and South.

Probably the only way the poor canget any improvement in their standard of living is by political means, however, socially and psychologically they are unable to organize. This lack of organization is a primary cause of their low economic status and their absence of any political power what so ever.

The poor are invisible to the political parties and politicians and to the majority of people in our society and to a certain extent even to themselves.

HURLEY, HELEN

ESSAY # 1

Why are there so many poor people in a rich society like the U.S.A.?

The answer to this question is a very difficult thing to accept. Most people have their own personal opinions, and if you were to state an answer, no matter how detailed and complete, there will always be those who want to delete certain parts or add something new.

In our society there is an obvious group of people who are poor, not only for the lack of money, but also for the lack of education and opportunity. There is not an equal balance of money in our country mainly due to human nature itself.

It seems that everyone is concerned about one thing - their own pocketbooks. When this situation exists there can be no shift in the direction of the flow of money to the poor.

Many people think that automation is "taking their jobs away" and that this is the # 1 cause of unemployment, and in turn, poverty. I believe that automation is a good thing; true, it does put many out of a job, but there are programs for re-training these people. The problem here lies in the fact that the people are not given ample opportunity to re-train themselves, so they descend to lowly jobs with little income.

The environment in which the poor children grow up is so depressing that all anxiety or dreams of self-improvement are killed many times before they reach high school level.

Also, I think that there are many who are very intelligent and capable of learning, but they just do not have the facilities to prove their abilities.

The fear of entering into the so called "higher society" has also held many back.

If only the young people could be reached and put into an environment which would give them some encouragement, probably they would in turn help others, etc.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

There are sixty million poor people living the most prosperous country in the world today. These people are defined as having an annual income of $ 3000 or less per family. How did these people come into society, where are they geographically, and what can be done to remedy this situation?

First of all, we must recognize this as a moral problem. It simply isn't "right" for the rest of the nation to ignore these oppressed people while they enjoy the better things of life that our country offers.

But the morality of the American people has gone through a change. The only that that they worry about is money...as long as they are satisfied, they don't care about anything else... or anybody else. This apathy toward the poor can be explained through an inspection of our economic and political systems.

Taking the economic system, it is very clear that we in America are not following Adam Smith's ideal capitalism. The "rugged individualism" that prevailed at the onset of our country's birth were men worked together for the common good (as well as for their own) has become now "every man for himself." The collaboration of small, one-man owned businesses into huge trusts and corporations has given the men "at the top" so much more power than the workers at the bottom.

The uneven distribution of income is so great that it is obvious that there is something wrong with the system. It is universally assumed that each man gets what he deserves, that income is in proportion to the type of job one performs in society. If you consider the low-paying jobs, you will see that most of these are very necessary to society. The potato pickers, garbage men, etc. cannot be eliminated. We need these workers, yet we pay them so little. Is there a way that we could bring these jobs to a greater dignity in our country?

Consider now the political situation of the poor. They are powerless and voiceless. Most of them are under represented in Congress; and the ones who are represented have hardly any advantage since their representatives are apathetic towards them anyway.

How can we allocate more power to these poor people? Perhaps that is impossible, that we cannot "allocate" power to them; they must acquire power. The Black Muslim movement with the slogan of "Black Power" is one of the ways that an attempt is being make. The Negroes are organizing, and someday will (hopefully) attain the power they want. But what about the poor whites? Why aren't they organizing? Maybe many of them are content with what they have, but this is highly improbable. If they think that gheir fellow whites in Congress and other political institutions at the state and local levels are going to help them out, I'm afraid they are greatly disillusioned. They tend to identify themselves with the other whites who are in power and this is going to prove to be a handicap to them.

In our supposedly "open-class system" today, it is possible for a person to move from one social stratum to another by taking on the characteristics of the class in which they want to move. This is true for the middle class, but I believe that this does not apply to the poor. Their poor health, lack of initiative and belief in success cripples their ability to move up the ladder.

Their psychological make-up is such that it is virtually impossible for them to accept the norms of the middle class.

JACKSON, ROBERT

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U.S.A.?

I think that there are many reasons why there are poor people in a rich society like ours. Some of them stem from political, economic, social, racial, psychological reasons,etc. I think that if one is to solve this problem, or perhaps more correctly, to answer it with any degree of accuracy one must not limit ones investigation to any one of these above mentioned fields but, on the contrary,one must consider them all for what they are worth.

It is generally known that whoever controls the political institution of a nation also controls it's wealth - to different degrees of course, depending upon the economic system involved. It is my contention and belief that one reason why there are poor people in a rich society like ours is that the poor people do not have any real political power, i.e., they cannot make demands on individual politicians which will be respected. Thus, their condition is stagnant; they cannot have the opportunity to progress like the mainstream of the American society.

Education also is a reason why there is poverty, or rather the lack of it. I think that in most cases where poverty is not voluntary the victims of it are undereducated. Consequently, they cannot demand the kinds of jobs which would elevate their position in society. Education, I think, also plays another role: It provides a stimulus for advancement. The educated person, usually, sets his sights on higher horizons, whereas the undereducated are limited not only by their lack of education but also limited as to their choices of position is society.

I think that race also has a place in this problem. For example, in this society most Negroes are poor. This seems incredible to me if I don't accept the premise that there is some force which prohibits them from achieving like other Americans have achieved. I absolutely reject the cliches, i.e., all Negroes are indolent, etc. I think that there have been and indeed still are definite instances, in parts of this country, to limit the Negroes success, especially his economic success.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

There are many reasons why there are poor people in our society. The main reason is, I think, the economic system - capitalism. It is inevitable that in this system people will be poor. Capitalism could not exist today if there were no poor people to perpetuate the system.

The nature of the system, I might add, imbues in people a sense of competitiveness which results in the vicious get-ahead-at-any price attitude. People in this system, even those of us who detest it, acquire these empty outlooks on life. Suddenly we find that life means only the accretion of material wealth. There is no love of humanity in this. It appeals to all of man's base and destructive tendencies.

I further contend that all of the things, i.e., the different disciplines - economics, psychology, political science, and sociology which we have learned in this course are directly related to and resultant from this economic system.

The economics of the situation is obvious. The poor don't have the things which are essential to a basic human existence. I need not talk about this sense it, as we know, is a product of the system.

Psychologically speaking, the helplessness and indifference which is felt by the poor are caused by the enormity of the system as compared to the individuals who know that they cannot change or in any significant way coreect the system. This is presupposing, of course, that the poor are aware that their plight is due to the economic system. In most cases, not only among the poor but also among the well off, we are not aware of why there are poor people in this society because we have been manipulated. In fact in order for this system to create the type of economic man required to function in the system, manipulation must be employed.

Most of the social attitudes which are harbored in this society are resultant from the attitude toward others we acquire from living in the system. This perhaps is a reason why poverty has been perpetuated in America. Most Americans,even though they don't call it thus formally, believe in a form of Social Darwinism, i.e., survival of the fittest. It is easy for them and they do it quite nonchalantly, to say "I made it through my own hard work. Why can't they do the same thing. They are all alike lazy, shiftless people who really don't want to get ahead."

Another reason why poverty is perpetuated is that the poor have no economic or political power. And because they lack this power they are left at the mercy of the cruel majority. Again we see the type of man this system creates. It creates men who are obsessedwith making profits. They don't give a damn about whether people eat, sleep, or even live, their only preoccupation is the accretion of profit.

Because the poor have no real power they are trust into a vicious circle which prevents them from rising out of the gutter even though they may want to and have the incentive to. It is amazing to me that they manage to have hope. For once you are on the botton you can kind of sense the helplessness of your position. You don't know what it is but you know that there are some forces pushing you down and while not an increasing force it tends to push just enough to keep you where you are.

The government is not a true representive in any real sense of the American people but rather it represents the managerial and the entrepreneurial classes.

It has initiated a poverty program which is not designed to eliminate poverty but rather designed to present the poor with the facade of halp and elevation.

JACKSON, ROBERT - cont'd.

What I have tried to say, with little success, is that the reason why their are poor people in this oociety is that it is because of the economic-capitalism. I am sorry that I have not been able to articulate my position more lucidly, however, it is very difficult to think clearly with a hangover.

JACOBS, THEODOLPH, JR.

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U.S.A.?

(This is my belief of one aspect of the problem.)

Since no one is really able to give a satisfactory answer I believe that the majority of the problem lies in the people themselves. I don't believe that the blame should be placed upon the government because the efforts made by the government to combat poverty maybe one of the great reasons for this poverty.

I believe that in a society such as the U. S. where hardly anything is forced upon people and so many opportunities exist to help the poor (without their working for the help) - in this lies one of the many reasons.

It is very true that many poor people deplore their financial sitaation and strive to better but many sit back and wait for the government to give them free aid. These people lack the self pride and initiative to go out andlearn a trade where they are sure to receive a job.

Most of unemployment in the country is not due to automation but due to the failure of American men and women to get up, go out and learn these technological skills (where most jobs lie). It has been said that there are more jobs than people to fill them: then why unemployment? Because of the above mentioned atatements.

Another contributing factor to this problem isthe continuance of the United States toward a socialistic path. I do not believe that given everything a person could ask for, free of charge, and a job - ultimatum many people would choose the job. Why work when you can get it free? Now, don't get me wrong I realize that many of the plans, such as Social Security, OASI and even Medicare might very beneficial to many people, but when the requirements for welfare checks are so low that even a strong, able bodied person can apply and receive money we are on somewhat of a wrong track. This welfare is necessary for such as many unwed mothers or disabled persons, but there should be limits.

Again I say, I believe that if the people didn't have this great U. S. government to depend upon they would learn the new and necessary skills and the unemployment would first go down causing the poor people to raise themselves at least to middle class. I see no reason why the United States in all of it's glory can't have enough wealth to go around if one is ambitious enough to take the opportunity.

My uncle once said - If a man can't make it in the U. S. - he can't make it in Heaven! Opportunities unlimited.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

At the beginning of this course, I thought I had an answer, now, I can't even begin to explain because I am very confused about the grave question.

First I would say that the poor people are not helped and lifted out of their condition because of the fact that they are invisible to the rest of the world. By this invisibility I mean that the people know poverty exists just as they know trees exist, but they fail to empathize with the poor and have no realization of the conditions of poverty.

A second reason would be that poverty is perpetuated by our very economic system. American capitalism is a system whereby the few elite exploit the lowly, solely for profit and gain. Ours is a system of materialistic values, therefore the better to do find it, not only convenient, but necessary to keep these poor people just where they are, this being to enhance the profits of the few large corporations that control our economy.

Another possible reason for this complex problem is that of politics.

Everytime Congress tries to pass a bill that would aid these poor, even if the President has endorsed this bill, it is cut-up, compromised and finally the bill isn't "worth the paper it is written on". There exist so many different interests that what would be done to help one will hurt the other. So we have a continuous compromise and the result is that nothing is accomplished.

Now we come to what I believe is just about the major reason for poverty in America - that is the psychological attitude of the poor.

Over the years, and for varied reasons the poor have come to accept their position. And they are to the point now, where they have ceased to better themselves.

One's first reaction to this statement would probably be "That's because they are lazy" (That was my opinion) but it is necessary to understand that for at least 100 years these poor have been promised a way out and received a kick in the pants.

They have seen sly politicians "use them" solely for personal gain. They have seen generation after generation in the same miserable condition (this being the vicious circle) so they too have lost hope.

They realize that no one can see them, and they have learned to mistrust all offers of help, because help is never given. It is this condition of apathy on the part of the poor which helps perpetuate poverty. (I am not saying that they have no right to be apathetic because they certainly do). I think it is necessary to discuss the psychological attitude of those in power also. As I said before, when I came into this course, my attitude was that of "shame on the poor because they are lazy".

This is an out right myth perpetrated by those in power in order to keep the poor where they are (i.e.,at the most beneficial level. This myth has become so widespread that now even many of the poor have been forced to believe this. This myth alone is enough to keep poverty in America and everyplace else forever.

If all people who are a little better off than the poor folk believe this myth, why should they want to help. There attitude is "I worked for what I got, let them do the same". The only trouble is, this is impossible because of their vicious circle of life (which I don't feel like describing at this time). These are some of the reasons for why (absolute) poverty exists in the rich United States.

JOHNSON, SUZANNE

Essay 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U.S.?

The words "poor" and "rich" are only good when used as comparative terms. The United States is, generally, a rich society compared to other countries like India or China. The poor people are only poor as compared to the rich in the U.S. Our poor would probably be rich or at least middle class if they had the same income and lived in India.

It seems to me that poor people exist in the U.S. mainly because of a lack of knowledge.

First of all, they usually lack an educational skill. This makes it difficult for them to get a good job by which they may earn a decent living.

Secondly, they may lack opportunity or simply the knowledge that there are opportunities which they may share. In today's world hundreds of thousands of dollars in scholarships are awarded each year to needy students. However it is quite obvious that not all the students who could use the scholarships get them. There are also trade schools and the Job Corps which are an attempt to give those lacking skills a means by which to obtain a skill. But still the fact remains that many who have the native ability to take advantage of college scholarships do not and many who could have gone to a trade school do not attend.

Why? I believe there are basically two reasons. One, as I've said before, is a simple lack of knowledge that the opportunities exist. Secondly is a type of "sourgrapes" psychology. When people have very little and are constantly forced to face the fact that most people have much more than they, they may rationalize their situation. They may say "I wouldn't want to be rich anyhow" or "The rich aren't happy". This type of thinking tends to stagnate their existence; to kill their ambition to rise on the social or economic ladder.

Lastly, even when poor people are given money (by the government or anybody else) they often do not know how to use. They waste it and soon find themselves in their previous poverty stricken situation.

Poverty is a relative thing. I believe it stems from an environmental condition (time)

Essay 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U.S.?

I feel that I could never truly answer this question. However, I do have some opinions on the subject, many of which have changed since the beginning of the course. I will attempt to enumerate them as honestly as I can.

One of the major factors resulting in the number of poor people in our country is their simple lack of power.

JOHNSON, SUZANNE (con't)

They are not organized politically for they are too poor to contribute financially to the party machine. As for the power of the vote, the poor are often jipped here too, In many areas, the apportionment of voters per representative leave the poor at a decided disadvantage and certainly the politician prefers to cater to the middle class whose votes are worth more both financially and influence-wise.

But the poor are also lacking in economic power. The unemployed are worried about where their next meal is coming from and not how they should organized to elect so-and-so to office. Even those on the job are often not organized into labor unions. They are forced to labor at rediculously low wages and bad conditions because they can not exert enought pressure on their employers. They are often unskilled or semiskilled, too, which puts them at a decided disadvantage in the labor market to begin with, for they do not possess the skills that are in demand. If the poor could get economic power I believe that political power would be the direct result.

The poor are handicapped form the start because of their educational deficiency. They have never been taught skills that would give them a decent position in the working class society. Neither are they aware of the opportunities that do exist to help them. They might be paying a pretty high price for food in one area when only three blocks away goods are much cheaper. Becasue they are constantly being forced to worry about where their next meal is coming from, one cannot expect them to realize that by banding together, by uniting they would have power and strength. These people need to be educated; to be taught practical things that could help them out of their misery.

Our welfare system, too, is as Harrington put it "upside-down". It affects some of the poor, but, for the most part, it does little to help those who are most in need of it - the starving; the truly impoverished.

Psychological factors play a part too. Many have a defeatist attitude. They lack the hope needed for them to be even happy in a spiritual way. A lack of hope, to me,is the worst poverty of all.

25% of poor families are matriarchial. Such a situation leads to crime among young males because of their psychological need to prove their masculinity. They are forced into gang violence ratner than constructive action.

The poor, too, are the objects of discrimination. The Negro oollege graduate, according to *Rich Man, Poor Man*,often gets as much money as an 8th grade educated white man.

the poor, say the middle and upper classes, are poor because they are "lazy " or because they "deserve it". For that matter, many of the upper-classes people do not even know poverty exists. Until they become aware of that fact, until they realize that they must help the poor to help themselves, until they are willing to give a little of their time and power and money, until they truly care about the poor, the poor will remain just as they are - starving, poorly clothed, ill-housed, sickly, and unemployed.

LAYTON, PAULINE

ESSAY # 1

Thus far in the human experience, people in democratic society have divided naturally into three groups: the rich, the poor, and the people in the middle economic bracket. The middle group has occassionally shrunken, but the poor people have always been present in every such society.

This may be a national evil of the system. Or again, poverty may be avoidable. In the United States today, the most notable characteristic of the poor is a feeling that they are doomed to failure and frustration. They do not care to work hard to climb out of their poverty. The ones with drive are able to surmount the difficulties of being born in low surroundings; it is only the spiritless who are left.

Society nowadays seems evenato have set itself to encourage the poor and jobless to remain so. Workmen's compensation is higher than the minimum wage; is it any wonder these people prefer to stay on relief? Besides the mother who is separated from her husband gets money to bring up the children fatherless, a condition that leads the children even more to lawlessness and disrespect for hard work. The poor, in their own ways, are opportunists. The young men would rather work in a garage and get more pay now than join the Job Corps with a promise of higher pay later. They do not plan ahead but only care for the pleasures of the moment. All through the South can be seen wooden shacks with shining television aerials. Perhaps they have a lack of faith in tomorrow.

Certainly those who work hard to become rich have faith that they will be around to spend their money; otherwise they wouldn't work so hard. In the past, the poor have had good reason to have no faith. In Europe wars regularly ravaged wealth for over a thousand years. But in this country, now, is the atomic bomb such a threat? Besides, this country has not been overrun. Perhaps this lack of faith is a hangover from Europe, passes on from generation to generation in the family culture causing poverty even now.

ESSAY # 2

The problem of causes of poverty in the U. S. is much harder than I thought it was when I started this course. I still think that a defeatist attitude brought over by peasants from Europe and transmitted to people who became poor while here is one of the causes of poverty. Because, due to wars, unscrupulous nobles, or depressions, there was little point in planning far ahead or saving money for most of the peasants in Europe, they squandered what money they had on things that would give them immediate pleasure. Today in this country, although planning ahead and saving money are possible and profitable, there are powerful commercial interests ordering people through the mass media to indulge themselves to buy all the wonderful things that are on the market.

Well, a person who comes from a poor home in a poor neighborhood with an inferior educational system who is bombarded by demands to splurge his money on material goods and not encouraged to want to be more educated is not going to make a big squawk and try to get local educational facilities improved so his children will get on better. I think if you look at the beginnings of the movements for bussing children and so on you'll find they were started by higher class people, although

LAYTON, PAULINE - cont'd.

once the poor have heard the whole spiel they can parrot it. Uneducated people have, and I can say this from my own experience, far less resistance to sales talk and advertising propaganda.

Thus poverty becomes a vicious cycle, with susceptability to propaganda and poor education leading to susceptability and poor education. The rest of the nation, unaware of this cycle, think of the poor as confirmed in their poverty - they don't want to get out because they're too lazy, therefore they don't deserve to get out.

However, the people who are better off are risking a downwards spiral. They, too, a susceptable to advertising and may in a generation or two, join the poor of the nation. This is especially so because automation will cut down on the number of jobs. For further thoughts along this line, see my term paper.

LIPORTO, ANNA

ESSAY # 1

Although the United States is an affluent society with many opportunities and benefits for it's citizens, it is not Utopia and problems such as poverty exist. Since we are not living in a completely socialistic country where everyone is completely equal in possessions, there are various income levels. Fortunately, in the U. S. it is easier to climb to another class than it is in India. Theoretically, in the U. S. we are all equal, equal that is as far as right and opportunities go. But we are not all equal. We are all unique, individuals born with different capabilities, in different environments, who develop different interests, various strengths and weaknesses, and have a wide variety of aims and attitudes. Education is supposed to be the instrument of success. In some areas of the U. S. facilities are entirely inadequate, even to the point of being non-existent. And if they do exist, how can afarmer who is barely getting by, afford to have his children go to school, leaving him to work the farm alone. If he has not had much formal education himself, he probably does not believe in the necessity of it, thinking it is a waste of time. A destitute person cannot wait for dreams to come true in ten years, he wants to see immediate change. How can a child living on such a farm ever rise from his poverty? It is only natural that he adopts his parents' viewpoints. Of course, some decide that they are going to work and get away. Some do, and go far in the world. But many either do not have the ambition, or are unable because they are somehow trapped by circumstances. The U. S. is not the only rich country with poor people. Every country has to deal with the economic, environmental, and other aspects of poverty.

ESSAY # 2

Few people really care whether or not there are poor people in the United States. In this abundant land we sit at home with our middle class values wrapped up in status and materialistic things. We never think of the poor; we have protected ourselves so well. We don't want to think about them because they would challenge our great American myths. If we thought about them we would have to act, and that would disturb our complacency. We rationalize ourselves into thinking the poor are lazy, or stupid. We say in this great country everyone gets what he deserves. We say they don't work. The worst joke is that the poor are happy. How can you be happy when there's a gnawing ache in your stomach? When you know your kids are going to live the way you have? When there's no hope of getting out of the rotten mess your in because nobody cares. The kids here say "Sure we're going to help the poor", but after a week of being back home this whole course will be a bad dream. I'm afraid. I've always wanted to be a social worker and I spent a weekend with one of the girls here. I'm afraid that I'm going to want and like material things and forget or become highly dissatisfied if I went into this career.

How could the poor be happy and want to remain poor in a society of such wealth, that puts such a great emphasis on money and material things? They are in a vicious circle and only a tiny fraction of them will ever get out. We never will give them a change, and if we do, we will forcethem to accept our values. Education is almost impossible for them. They are discriminated against. They cannot get jobs because of both these factors. They have no political power because

LIPORTO, ANNA - cont'd.

they have no money. Our economy doesn't need them to function - if it did , the problem of poverty would have greatly be reduced, even eliminated. There are poor people because we don't give them a chance. We don't give them the opportunity to prove themselves. We beat them down. And if by some miracle they raise themselves up out of the muck, we don't accept them. We snub them. There are so many factors economical, political, sociological, and psychological. No one answer can be given to this question. We saw why they were hopeless, how they were affected by their environment, the absence of power and money. We saw our responsibility to them and how we must share the blame.

LOACH, MARY

Essay 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the USA?

In my mind poor people are the result of numerous and varying causes. People, such as the Negro or members of any minority group, live in poor conditions becuase of their ancestry. Grandparents and great grandparents were poor and poverty seems to pass from generation to generation. Somehow I connect it with a deep well into which one seems to fall, slipping continuously but sort of unconscious concerning his own misfortune. Or, as a Catholic, it appears to me as a physical illness much as the spiritual disease - sin. A person can feel himself failing but when he reaches a certain low~~ee~~/ spot, the end seems inevitable. But the NEgro must face prejudice, a lack of education, and this type of poverty is inescapable. Yet white or blac, poverty seems to grasp people so tightly that a general attitude of acceptance become prevelent. I think mental illness, meaning apathy and discouragement keep Americans poor. But, if morale is high, it can be overcome. AS a~~s~~n example I use the Irish immigrants. Upon arrival in New England, they found themselves ignorant and unwanted. They employed strong bodies and attempted to Americanize themselves. To me it seems that poverty stricken areas are often the homes of unamericanized immigrants who thrive on the way of life in the old ocuntry. They gathered at first for general security, most likely to experience the social acceptance of being with persons like themse.ves. This serve the first generation well but as they children aged, the recognized the contrast between themselves and those around them. They completely ignored the customs of their ethnic communities. The third generation respected the old but enjoyed the new. But the persons who remained foreign kept the same customs, jobs which eventually were blotted out, and found themselves unable to cope with the modern world. As a result these persons live in the Negro ghettos, in set off parts of the city , and as poor people.

Economics is a subject of which I understaad~~d~~little so I must plead ignorance to the economical causes.

As I me~~a~~ntioned before I recognize both from personal experience and from reading, the "sick" attitude of the poor. They feel that life has cheated them and that the world offers no chance for freedom. They exist but are unable to enjoy life for life means problems. Life becomes an endurance test. Tehy picture authority as "a drag". Officers means party-poopers or kill-joys. They see American society as a luxorious select group which has no worries and cares little for its poor. There is a lack of communication between the sections of our society. The materialism ... (time)

LOACH, MARY (con't)

Essay 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like America?

I. Sociological Reasons:

The poor are not viewed as individuals. IN our American society, the class system divides people as to wealth. With this wealth comes power. The poor, having neither of these, fall into ClassV.

At the same time, the middle class represents the largest percent of Americans. The lower classes are unable to assimilate themselves into this class. They possess different values, goals, and norms. The complaisant middle class choses to ignore these people. Thus American poor people become invisible. By slums and ghettos, they are hidden.

II. Economic Reasons:

The poor are economically poor. They live without the luxuries and conveniences of the American way. Since they lack adequate education, they are unable to attain high-paying jobs. A lack of skill and often intelligence, make it necessary that these people take on the lower tasks of society. Most of them receive under $3,000 a year. Because of their low incomes, the poor do not have power. THis power is a necessity if they are to raise themselves.

III. Psychological Reasons:

Most of the poor are poor because their parents were poor before them. They are born into the "Invisible America'. They are seen by the upper classes as "people who deserve what they get. These "average" Americans claim to have no prejudices yet through their attitudes they keep the poor down. With encouragement, the poor cannot fight. According to the American ideal, the rich are willing to assist those less fortunate. Thus the rich give donations - but only to satisfy their own conscience. They contribute money but no real assistan ce. Even the monetary gifts are made without sacrffice for they are willing to give as long as it doesn't cost themselves. ON the other hand, the people of Class V are kept down by their own attitude. They view themselves as people destined to poverty. Hopelessness pervades their lives.

V. Political Reasons

In theory, each American is "created equal", born with "inalienable rights". The poor are excluded from this in practice. Laws favor big business. Because the poor have no wealth, they are politically invisible. Politicians cannot afford to devote their time and energy to the poor.

People are poor because they "have no money. They have inadequate education. Many have low IA's and thosewho are born with higher intelligence never have the opportunity to reach their potential.

The poor are caught in a vicious circle. Working all day prevents their occupation with freedom.

In the past few years, certain portians of the poor have revolted. They have protested the type of work they do. Yet without these people to do this work, what would society do? Should we raise the dignity and wages of such workers or should we invent thousands of machines to take over this work? Besides, without these jobs, how would we occupy these people/ Should we retrain them or provide government allowances? Even though these protesting groups have been led by capable leaders, it is impossible to organize them because of various reasons. For example, the migrant workers: since they travel throughout the country, an organization cannot become an important part of their lives. Besides, to keep such a movement alive, financial resources must be considered. A man who is struggling to keep his family fed and clothed can hardly be expected to hand over dues to an organization which seems to do nothing for him. The poor are impatient: they want immediate action and success.

Lack of education is a main cause pf poverty. Becuase of automation, many of the poor have lost their jobs. Since they have no skills, many of them remain unemployed or seek other available work.

Because of urban renewal, the poor have lost their homes, also. Before the poor can be raised, it is necessary that the American people first recognize the problem and then become determined to solve it.

MCPARTLIN, JOAN

Essay #1

The first band of pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock in 1620. These English settlers were the first to settle in the U.S. disregarding the Indians who already inhabited the land. These hard working people worked to make a new home for themselves, and eventually they gave birth to a great nation.

More English settlers landed and the population began to climb. These people were all proud of what they had done with this unknown territory. Eventually, immigrants from other countries came to the land where the "streets were paved with gold." The all settled in one section, and formed their ghettos. This was only natural because they all shared the same interests, customs, history and ideas of making a better life for themselves.

A language barrier existed so this prevented any foreigner from gettingas good a job as he wished. And si it happened that these people were forced to take low paying jobs or starve. The result was slum areas where the chance for improvement was slight.

The high-brow English, who were the first settlers and who were firmly established, did not appreciate what was happening. They held the upper hand and did not attempt to improve the situation for the immigrants. Rather, they got richer from having these people work in their factories with the poor citizens only got poorer.

The same situation exists today. The circumstances may vary a little but the general idea is there. Such a situation is still evident today in Boston, for example. 1The long line of "proper Bostonians" keeps getting longer. __ A reason for this and why the rich don't help the less fortunate may be because all people tend to be egocentric. (time)

Essay #2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U.S.?

During the past six weeks I have learned that a question such as this cannot be answered without a thorough knowledge of all the disciplines concerned with it. I feel that this course has given me many important insights so that I might attempt to begin to answer this question.

The most important reason thepoor still exist is the fact that most people just don't see them and don't want to concern themselves with problems other than their own.

The poor are usually found in some section of every city. But the fact that they live together does not mean they are unified. One of their major problems is the fact that they do not organize. They have no voice in the government. At election time politicians will make campaign platforms which promise to alleviate their situation but after the election

MCPARTLIN, JOAN (con't)

the poor are forgotten and realize they have been exploited once again.

This is just one instance where their hope has been shattered. They have no representation in the government therefore there is never any legislation passed in their behalf, but other Americans expect the 50 million who are poverty stricken to be proud of the land of the free and the brave.

Since the poor constitute the lower class in this society's strata, there is only one direction in which they can go - up. But if one looks at what group exists directly above them, it is not hard to understand why they stay down. The other class is the lower-middle. The people in this group are striving to attain middle-class acceptance. Therefore they suppress the lower-class by any available means. If the poor become equal with them then they feel all hope is lost.

I shall name a few groups and try to state briefly their situation: the farmers, the small urban farmers, constitute only a small percentage of the population. 1Their farms are their whole lives. They ahve been brought up on them and know no other life. Therefore, they cannot be expected to change. The larger farmers have taken over all the business and have all modern machines at their disposal - and the smaller farmers cannot even begin to compete with this.

Another group are the matriachal families. The father has probably left because of the hopelessness of his family's situation he cannot cope with. The mother is left behind usually with at least three children and the responsibility of running a home. 1The situation only goes from bad to worse. The mother no matter how good she is =- is not lokely to be able to carry this burden alone. This is reflected and her children usually turn out delinguqent.

The alcoholics compose a pathetic group. Most alcoholics drink till they are "flat broke." Some may come from good families with a substantial income and others may come from the slums. THere is little class distinction among these people. They have little hope and very little ambition to improve their situation. They have probably left their families and are just trying to drink their problems away.

Migrant workers live in a vicious circ.e They follow the crops across the country and hope that the owner needs workers to harvest his crop. Their living facilities are disgusting. Because they travel so much their children receive very little formal education, and the only life the children know is that of their parents. Each generation has a more difficult time trying to escape the hammer lock of the migrant workers life.

The saddest situation is that of the Negroes. They are found in every slum of almost every city. Because of the color of their skin, they face a high wall which they scale with their bruised knees - they are almost to the top where they see the light, but they fall back down. Only a very few make it to the top.

These are only a very few problems facing the poverty-stricken. A very basic step which must be taken is to awake people to the plight of the poor. People have to care about other people, and until that time the situation will remain serious.

MILLER, WILLARD

Essay #1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the USA?

THis question, of course, has been asked many times, usually as a means of finding a solution to poverty. Many truthful explanations to this question can be made, but a single answer which is correct in the minds of many person s might be impossible to find.

In the animal kingdom individuals can be considered poor in comparison to othrs of their species, when they are physicaly weaker, or when they happen to live in areas where living is especially difficult. This reason for poverty can be recognized in human~~g~~ beings also. Because intelligence in human beings today is the more imortant than physical strength and endura nce, in determining wealth or poverty, differences in intelligence of individual human beings might be part of the answer to the question. Also~~K~~, as in the animal kindgom, "regional poverty" can be sighted as another reason for poverty in our rich country. THat is, regional groups which find living and acquiring wealth especially difficult becuase of a lack of industry or a poor agricultural production in their area.

Another answer to the question of why there is poverty in our rich nation could be that the rich are not content with their wealth and seek to acquire more. THe rich are also often afraid of sharing their good fortune and feel a need to hold on tightly to their riches. An example of this idea is the attitude of the wealthy Californian in John Steinbeck's Grapes ofWrath. Those people, wealthy in comparison to the indigent migrants, were afraid to share any of their wealth.

These are only two of the many small answers which can be sighted as reasons for poverty. (time)

Essay #2

The "question" of this course has been: "Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?" But I think that to be more in line with what we've been studying this course question could be changed to "what's wrong with AMerica?" We know that there has been poverty through history - a more absolute and extensive poverty than is found in the USA today. The kind of poverty that exists in America today is mostly a relative type of poverty. This powerty is a tragedy, however, because in our rich and technological society there is no reason or justification for the existence~~øø~~of a poor minority. From this point in discussion of the matter I might move to the conclusion that poverty is definitely evil and we must immediately find a plan to solve all of this evil in our society. One of the things that has been emphasized in this course, however, is that we are not looking for solutions or quick ways out of the problem but that we need to learn more aboutthe

the problem and to study all aspects of it. This has been most frustrating to the students because mose of us have learned that whenever we come into contact with any kind of problem we judge the severenes of it and then look quickly for solution.

In this course we have learned that the problem of poverty is an extremely complx one which involves many aspects of study. Many of us chose an aspect or discipline of study (eg. psychology, pol. scil, etc) quite early in the course from which we viewed the problems brought before us - thus reducing the complexity of the problem to the interests of one particular field of study. In our reading we tended to center only on those aspects of the problem which interested us individually - I think this is true of most of the students. THus most of us in this course found ways to escape the complexity of the problem. To really answer the question well, the viewpoints of the several disciplines must each be expressed and this can be done by few people. If I attempt to answer the problem I will produce an answer lacking the view of other field s of study.

I have said that this course might be called "What's wrong with America?" In answer the question "Why are there poor people in a rich society like the USA?" we must look for reasons - causes of the problem and not solutions. A basic of aur learnings in this course has been that our economic system plays an extremely important role informing AMerican life and social problems like poverty (this implys that something is wrong with our system if it procuded tragedys like AEmrican pvoerty). As Mr. Maccoby has said - "Character is a response to the economy reality"! - In the USA the goals, attitudes, aspirations, conscience - the character of the individual is strongly tied to the reality of our economic system - capitalism. We have learned that under capitalism selfishness if a virtue (D. Dowd). - THis is significant when we find that the poor are often invisible to the relatively well-off individuals of America. THe middle and upper classes don't give a damn about the poor - or else they can not recognize the poor, because under capitalism they must maintain attitudes of selfishness - striving for person economic success and trying to get ahead. I"m not sure if this is a bsic cause of poverty or if it is only one way in which the problem has been permitted to exist - certainly the consequences of the upper classes "not giving a damn" can promote the increase of poverty and contribute to keeping the poor people and keeping the black back.

This brings to mind another aspect of poverty which has been an important part of this course - civil rights. Perhaps this has been stresses because there are Negreos and whites in this course together and they are interested in resolving conflicts and trying to follow an idea. Racian prejudice has been one of the focal points of some of our discussion sessions and many BSsessions in the boys dorm, and probably in the girls dorm. Civil Rights issues are important and relevant to the problem of poverty since we have learned that

MILLER, WILLARD (con't third page)

about half of American Negroes are at a poverty level and that about 1/4 of the poor are Negro.

It seems that every person has certain prejudices and the degrees of prejudice vary with the individual. jAFter being here at Cornell for 6 wks I think that specifically racial prejudice will never be totally abolished - unless, of course, all physical, economic, social, and cultural differances between people are abolished. THis means intermingling and complete integration - something which will take a long time.

Many of the problems of (time)

MOONEY, MARTHA

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U. S. A.?

I would like to begin by saying that, from my knowledge, the U. S. has less poverty, in proportion to the population, than almost, any other nation in the world. By poverty, I mean a state in which people can't live in reasonable comfort, or pursue the goal of a happy, full life. (I don't feel I know enough about poverty to do a good job of defining it.)

If our nation is less poor, or richer, than any other nation, we must be doing something(s) right. We may have been already moving in the correct direction when our Federal Constitution was drawn up. What has held us back from our utopia has been human weaknesses such as prejudice, selfishness, pride, and thoughtlessness. Added to these faults are the problems of ignorance, poor immigrants (whom I welcome) and unavoidable, undesirable factors.

From personal experience and reading, I would guess that many problems, perhaps most, originate in the home, the most important basic group. Characters are formed. The chances for a happy life are greater for the child who is brought up in a balanced and normal family life. If more families existed in which interest in the welfare of others was strong, I am sure that our country would have less poverty. We wouldn't have greedy slumlords, or mistreated minority groups. An emphasis on otherness should be made in our society. I think it can be done.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

There are, in my opinion, two kinds of causes for poverty - immediate and long range or underlying causes. By immediate (or perhaps the word superficial cause would be better) I am refering to things such as sickness, mental illness, physical handicaps and retardation. But after reading the assignments and listening to and discussing with our professors, I think I believe that, however simple the statement may be, there is poverty in the United States or anywhere else because of human faults. An an idealist, I strongly feel that man does not have to consciously look out for himself at the expense of others. Of course, there are conflicting views on an issue, and each side may be sincere, but is it necessary for people to starve the weak? If there are some who are unwilling to help themselves because of pure laziness, what kind of problem is this? It all goes back to the same thing - human weaknesses or moral problems. What kind of people are slumlords? Why does a bill have to take such an impossibly long time to go through Congress when it is so crucial as something like Civil Rights?

If people really believed that there was something wrong, they would do something. If we kids were fully aware of the truth, we'd devote our lives to spreading it. The only thing is, how many of us will? Last night Jerry Surette summed it up by saying that this is a course in religion.

PETTOLA, GAY

ESSAY # 1

The "poverty pockets" woven deeply in cities, towns, and regions of the United States have been caused by many conditions, difficult to explain and broad in scope. I know very little about the reasons for this problem, only collecting little bits and pieces of information from varied and often unreliable sources. Lack of education seems to be one characteristic of America's poor. Those who have managed to obtain an education are often stopped by unfair labor practices, discriminating laws, and prejudice. Desire for success fades as people become more and more suppressed in their attempts to overcome these problems. Eliminating unfair practices and providing adequate education could improve the living standards of the poor, but people are people and such a simple answer could not remove all the disadvantages that keep the poor, poor. There must be hundreds of ideas I've never heard of, many reasons I've never encountered that can explain the existence of poor in America. I hope I am able to broaden my knowledge of these conditions this summer so when I become a working member of society I can understand the problems in it.

I can't write about something I don't understand, as you can see.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

The reasons for poverty in a country that should have no poverty are numerous and complex. Because poverty is a problem of the social sciences and not one specific area, it must be examined using several disciplines. Reasons for poverty, however, cannot be listed under political science, economics, sociology, or psychology; each discipline must be used to explain the others, connecting and joining the ideas until a broad understanding is reached.

Why is there poverty in the United States? Men do not care about their brothers; our economic system fosters selfishness and ignores man's duty to man. The impoverished cannot help themselves; they have no power to change the circumstances that keeps them poor. They lack education, employment, decent living conditions, a stable family structure. These are the conditions of poverty, but the reasons behind them are not qualities that the poor lack, but qualities that the rest of society lacks.

Man's inhumanity to man keeps some people poor, makes some people desolate, oppressed, overwhelmed by the society they live in.

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States? Because few people care enough and most care not at all about the slime that covers our cities, rural areas, everywhere. The poor do not keep themselves poor, their richer, happier, whiter brothers keep them poor.

RESTIERI, JANE

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U. S. A.?

In a rich society like the U. S. A. wealth is enjoyed by a small percentage. Poor people exist in every state and tend to have little or no education or job training or experience. Education or the lack of it determines in part your success in today's world.

Wealth is centralized in the hands of a few and many people do not have the opportunity to earn even a living wage. Prejudice and discrimination also help poverty to spread for they make people unable to live with themselves and therefore function as a member of a society

I really haven't thought or learned about this problem but I am looking forward to discussing, reading and learning about this problem during our social science course.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

Today, there are many poor people in the United States who live in slums, in migrant labor camps and depressed towns in Appalachia. Though our economy is affluent, people still are starving and homeless, lacking education and good paying jobs.

These poor people are unorganized and their respective groups are without good leadership. The poor have novoice in the government for they are not represented by any particular Senator or Congressman. They have no lobbyists in Congress and therefore lack an effective means of making their needs known.

Automation in factories have deprived many of their former jobs and now widespread unemployment exists among the poor. Their work is taken over by machines and they no longer feel like productive members of our society.

Lack of education is perhaps the most important factor in determining why there are poor people in a rich society. Many of the impoverished are illiterate, some have finished grade school, and very few have completedtheir high school training. Since they lack education, they are unable to qualify for certain jobs and therefore are employed in the low paying jobs as factory workers, street cleaners and garbage collectors. Many will never have the opportunity of learning to read and write and their children will not fare much better.

The poor are unable to rise above their present station. In many cases, they cannot escape from the ghetto and it's influence. Every attempt the poor make to better their conditions, they are supressed by the upper and middle classes.

In many large cities, urban renewal is tearing down low rent slums, leaving the people penniless and homeless.

Because of their conditions, the attitudes of the poor differ greatly from ours as middle class Americans. They are depressed, downhearted and without any hope for the future. They only think of food and clothing for themselves and their families. They are the victims of our rich society.

As more fortunate Americans, we are obligated to help our fellow humans to rise above their present conditions. We must truly try to carry out the concept of America - the land of opportunity.

RICKS, JOYCE

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U. S. A.?

A cycle exists among the poor that effects every generation. The cycle begins and continues due to the lack of organization and the development of negative ideas toward their situation.

The poor have always disagreed on what would be the best factor needed to erase the conditions they suffer. Those who believe that money will solve the problem discover that the money one does have is of little value if it is mismanaged. Education is needed, but what good is education if it is not used through the channels it was intended to be used?

Poor people in general have one belief in common, and this is a feeling of suppression from the middle and high classes. If a rich man can promote programs to his advantage and the poor cannot, why bother to correct this condition?

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

Our society is one which is composed of classes, the upper, middle, and lower. In order that this class structure remain, there must always be poor people, rich people and middle-income people.

The members of the upper and middle classes realize this and in their efforts to retain the status they have acquired, I believe they do their best to keep the poor poor.

Congress, which is made up usually of the middle and upper classes seldom pass bills that benefit the poor, yet appropriations for building are never slighted.

The general attitude of the upper and middle classes toward the poor reflects other means of keeping the poor poor. (1) The upper and middle classes, usually refuse to associate with the lower classes. They instill in their children the same feelings of superiority. Their children continue in the footsteps of their parents. (2) The upper classes usually hold the idea that the poor are shiftless and lazy. They therefore oppose almost any govermental programs that might help the poor. (3) One thing I have discovered in this program is that one of the reasons the upper and middle classes feel the way they do about the poor, is the fact that most of them do not know the actual plight of poor people. I discovered this after noticing the actions of some of the students in this class after they saw the movie "A Harvest of Shame"; and when I read of the reactions of the people toward Michael Harrington's book The Other America.. Therefore it might prove beneficial to give the middle and upper class people training programs in the distribution of wealth and the plight of the poor in the United States. They seem to be fully aware that poor exist in Asia and South America.

ROWAN, JAMES

ESSAY # 1

To begin to answer this question it is important to look to some degree at the history of man in general along with the American heritage. In every society, there are certain individuals who seem to be the "have-nots", who cannot support themselves by working. Society has had many solutions; some have condemned them; some have ignored them, and some find it morally necessary to support these people. In the United States, the latter has been, in general, the solution in the last twenty-five or thirty years. Beginning with the Depression legislation of F. D. R. and continuing with L. B. J., the country is heading for, in many ways, the "welfare state."

This is paralled by another trend in this country: more and more labor and lower class type jobs are being taken over by machines. This increased machinization has called for increased skills to get a job. Hence, the people who genuinely cannot achieve more than they have been, are left behind. The blacksmith, the elevator operator, and the fireman on a train, of 1940, are now the unemployed, or rather unemployables of 1966. It is true that some may be able to retrain themselves, but in general they have had jobs in which they worked reasonably close to there capacity. So here we have a paradox in American society: if this country hadn't movedahead so far and so fast technologically then the welfare program would have been mcuh more effective, because the numbers of impoverished people would remain proportionally the same. But because of the technological revolution, the welfare program has not beenaable to keep up with the poor people who recently were out of jobs, as a result of mechanization. So now we have another problem: can man increase his own capacity? As the demands on him increase more and more, and more labor-type jobs are eaten up, where will the people who are left behind find means to support themselves. The government could probably keep up, but the effect of not being forced to work for a living would be detrimental, certainly, to their characters. This all is a fraction, but an important one, of the answer to the question; why are there poor people in a rich society like the U. S.?

ESSAY # 2

It is of course, presumptuous to claim any kind of answer in such a short paper, I have learned in six weeks that the question is fantastically complicated and that one would have to sacrifice his intellectual integrity to write down an answer when he knows it would take a lifetime of study to comprehend the problem.

Poverty is a result of social, economic, psychological, and political reasons, each of which have their own subtopics, which in turn break down into more and more elements. It may even run into fields which we have not studied here. What I do know is that something must be done.

SEEGAL, FREDERIC

Essay #1

Given that politics is supposed to deal with the possible, the most significant factor that explains the existence of poor people in the US is the failure of the government to act in an attempt to alleviate the burdens of the poor.

As Galbraith has pointed out in the Affluent Society the traditional economics of despair and want no longer are relevant. It is his contention that poverty should not exist in the strength that it does. I believe that neither the government nor the wealthy have fully accepted this concept. The main question today in relationship to the existence of poverty in the U.S. is not whether we can solve our problems, but whether or not the country and the government really wants to do something about it. THe eradication of poverty is a goal that has received too much lip service and has yet to be firmly placed in the national consensus.

Perhaps the above response has begged the question. However I feel that the economic and social causes for poverty, or rather the existence of it, are overshadowed by the continuing favor to do anything about it. Each pocket of poverty has its own causes. The poor whites in the south can blame the failure of the industrial revolution to extend to their area. The negro can blame a century or more of social and economic isolation from the community. Almost all cases of poverty can be rationalized and accounted for on a superficial level. To borrow a term from economics, our national perspective on poverty has been localized in terms of micro-economics and has not been broadly viewed along the basis of macro-economics. While we tend to take an internationalist view on world affairs, we take a very isolationist perspective on poverty at home. It is foolish to blame capitalism for our problems becuase the basic problem is our national conscience. Given the resources of our national community and the power of the government to act, if not effectively, but at least with force, if the fact that poor people in the U.S. really was a cause for concern, some significant and meaningful actions would have already taken place. Men like Theobald seem to have taken a proper step and raised the proper tone of voice but no one seems to listen. Even when Milton Friedman advocates some form of a guaranteed income as a proper first step, the country and the government just turn their collective heads the other way. (time)'

Essay #2

After spending six weeks of barely scratching the surface of our question, I realize that I would be violating whatever intellectual integrity I have if I tried to answer the question. If I were to answer the question, all I could do is repeat isolated bits of evidence and reasoning presented in the course and reach a series of unrelated conclusions. The question is too complex to be answered in this space and time.

SESSIONS, CLIFFORD

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U.S.A.?

It is a hard, cold fact, that there are poor people in the United States. Why is this so in our so-called affluent society? I think that our high living standard and high relative wealth (when compared with the rest of the world) is an average, and like all averages, it evens out the vast difference between the two extremes. These extremes in American society, are the rich and the poor.

The actual reasons that these extremes exist are many and varied. One reason isthe natural difference between each individual person's mental and physical makeup. Some people are fighters and can make their own success. Witness the Carnegies and Rockefellers. On the other hand, the other extreme is the weak, inactive individual.

ESSAY # 2

Why is there poverty in a rich society like the United States?

There now seem to me to be several important reasons why there is poverty in our society. The most important one, I feel, is the apathy of those who have, coupled with the hopelessness and despair of the have-nots. The so-called "invisibility" of the poor is a facet of the apathy of the upper classes. These people, the ones who now have the power to help the poor, are not concerned enough to initiate a program comprehensive enough to rid the society of the complicated ills of poverty. On the other hand, the poor themselves are not politically or economically powerful enough to lift themselves up and out of poverty.

The poor have many strikes against them which make it extremely difficult to improve their status even when the educational, economic, political (voting), social or psychological advantages which each are given them. First of all, the poor come from a history of poor. Their lives have been long years of being hungry, living in hovels, doing lousy work for low pay, having babies, being exploited. All this will crush the spirit of a poor man when he looks ahead of hemself and sees years more of this in his life, and countless years more in the lives of his children and their children.

But despite all that can be said in regards to the helplessness of the poor, I feel that any solution must take into account upper class "don't-know-and-don't-give-a-damn-ism", for with the upper classes lies the power and the hope that is needed to purge poverty.

SHEFF, RONALD

Essay #1

In order to see why there are poor people in our society, it is first necessary to see why the majority of the society is not poor.

The basis of the United States' wealth lies in the rapid industrialization that took place in the four decades following the Civil War and the development of this process through the twentieth century. The appearance of the huge railroad, oil, and steel industries certainly did not alleviate poverty except in a very few instances, but it did provide the capital that could make alleviation possible. The essential problem was the distribution of the wealth, which was in the nineteenth century concentrated in the hands of relatively few people.

The twentieth century saw attempts on the part of the federal government to redistribute the nation's wealth. Examples include the graduated income tax, minimum wage legislation, and social security benefits. In this way, the government sought to extend the nation's wealth to all its citizens.

However, inevitably some people were passed by in this redistribution and ramin today as the poor. They had the misfortune to become engaged in an industry which became obsolete, or they were never trained in any industrial skills at all. Since the poor are engaged in a constant struggle to stay fed and clothed, they and their children have no opportunity to get the training necessary to benefit from the wealth of the society they live in. Trapped in this vicious circle, the poor can find no way out and remain as they are, passing their poverty on to their children. They do not participate in the affluence society and therefore cannot derive any benefits from that affluence.

Essay #2

The result of this course on me has been somewhat paradoxical. I've learned very many factors relating to poverty that I had no previous knowledge of. However, thie little bit of knowledge I have gotten has showed me how much I don't know, so I feel a little strange trying to answer the question.

The economic factors have to do with the capitalist ethic, which encourages competition for "the other guy" and security through monopoly for one's self. THus those who have nothing to start out with are ignored by the system, which is geared to production at the expense of human values.

The poor people can't change the system because they have no political power. THis is so in part because they have no economic influence in the first place, so the situation becomes a vicious circle. The poor have no lobbies in Congress and because they have not organized they have nott been able to vote in a bloc for Congressmen sympathetic to their plight. Thus they are left out of the political structure also.

SHEFF, RONALD (con't)

In addition, the middle classes, who have the numbers to help the poor, have been tacitly taught by our society to ignore them. We build beltways to avoid driving through slums; we live in suburbs to avoid seeing them; and we keep them ringed in ghettos through discrimination. Having no contact with the poor, it is easy for us to believe alienated knowledge of them, for instance that they are happy or just lazy. In other words, the middle class is kept from contact with poverty and then told that the poor like their condition. Under these conditions middle class apathy is inevitable.

This result of all these conditions is an unspoken conspiracy to let an intolerable situation perpetuate. The poor are kept from any contact, political, economic, or social, with the mass of the affluent society. Nothing is done for them and they can not do anything for themselves. As we have become richer, some people have remained poor and there is a lethargy which allows them to stay that way.

Of course this explanation has done far less than scratch the surface of the problem. The answer lies somewhere in dozens of comples factors which perhaps I am still not aware of. At least I now really know taht there are poor people, which is a start. I think it is important to recognize that poverty is not an anomaly but an entirely predictable result of a system which encourages people to concentrate on production and accumulation rather than on expanding their consciousness to be more aware of people. As long as we are economic men rather than just men in the best sense of the word, we will always have poverty.

The only thing wrong with the course is having class the day after that party.

KATHERINE SHUTE

SHUTE, KATHERINE

Essay #1

Although the United States is considered by many as a rich society, it is untrue to put all Americans in this class. For some people, circumstances which they cannot control have determined their material success or failure. While some have a natural ability and ambition to work and get ahead, others lack interest or the chance to better themselves. Thus, when a good job opportunity comes, the ambitious person will naturally do his best to be hired. On the other hand, a lazy type may prefer to do nothing but complain about his lot in life, convince himself that he isn't good enough to make a good living, and just give up hopes of any wealth. By taking this attitude, he is seriously damaging any chances he may have had.

It seems that once a person has been leveled as poor, and he hassettled for life in a slum area, it is most difficult for him to rise above his life.

However, the standard of living in the United States is so high in comparison with many other ocuntries, the seriousness of the poverty problem seems to be overlooked by many. Because the average yearly income of an American citizen is so high, the below average inoome family seems to be almost forgotten by some.

Therefore, in spite of government aids and poverty programs, some people are unwilling to face the reality of American poverty and to give of their own time and energy to remedy the situation.

Essay #2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

Although I knew before the course began that the porr of America were hidden, I didn't realize to what extent this was true.

To begin with, the poor aren't recognized by the ordinary man; clothes, cars and even homes can be effective disguises of the real financial situation. Because they don't appear to be poverty stricken, no one feels a pang of conscience about them, and nothing is done to help them.

However, in the hundreds of city slum areas are those who can't disguise their poverty. They are pitied by outsiders, but it seems that nothing is ever done to help them.

In general, the poor have no power in the United STates. Because of low-paying or undesirable jobs, they have no chance to get political connections; thus, they are never re-

SHUTE, KATHERINE (oon't)

presented in Washington, and their dause seems to be taken for granted as a necessary evil of society. Although some legislation, such as the war on poverty, has been passed, it is difficult to see any positive results.

It may be that society cause this. A major social upheaval, such as the removal of poverty, must take place over a long period of time and cannot be rushed. However, I think the problem lies in the attitudes of the general public. Many people seem so wrapped-up in their own personal lives, that they have no care for others. Selfishness, and not concern for others, seems to rule their lives. I believe that most people really don't care about the poor. Maybe they don't want to admit it, but it's true. They give excuses such as: the poor are just lazy, stupid people who don't care enough to better themselves.

I think poverty will continue as long as people care only for themselves. And I also feel that people in general are going to continue to be selfish as long as society emphasizes the struggle of competition and condones the method of "get what you can, and keep it."

1. poor are hidden in our world.
2. poor have no political power
3. selfish attitude of most people
4. life in a society that condones the method "get what can for yourself."

SOKOLOWSKI, DOROTHY

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

Where rich people exist in a society there must be poor people in order to preserve the balance in nature. If everyone was rich then everyone would be poor at the same time, since there could be no scale from which to judge. Now that this has been established one can, however, try to explain why there exists such a balance and thus why there are poor people in a rich society.

Looking back to the days of colonial expansion the names which associated with discoveries and inventions are names which today suggest wealthy families. The explorers, in this case, were either very wealthy or were assisted by those who possessed wealth. Those who worked for the wealthy explorer as crewman on ships, for instance, only received a small share of profit. This, of course, points out the distinction between the working class and the employing class. To get closer to the point of the question, one can see the beginnings of a wealthy class and a poorer class dependent upon the wealthy class.

Either it was fate or perhaps the character of the individual which placed some people in a better position than others. Yet, wealth would not lie evenly distributed. So, since the beginning of settlement in the U. S. A. and, moreover, since the beginning of time, some people have been able to make themselves financially richer than others because of their personality, because of fate, or because they were in the right place at the right time. Those who remained poor because of misfortunes or the like would not climb to the level of the wealthy class because as members of a working class they could only manage to live on their salary.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in the U. S. A.?

Since the beginning of the course many answers have been given to the question of why there is poverty in the United States. All the answers are valid and all work together to propagate poverty. The poorest people are suppressed by the upper and middle classes. These two classes control the society, in general, and keep the poor from making their way up the social ladder. Our system of government keeps the poor impoverished. The government controls income distribution by fixing prices etc. so that only certain classes can afford material things. Also, since in our system the employee only gets a small share of the employer's profit, people are kept immobile as far as increasing wages to any great degree is concerned. Prejudice by the white people keeps the Negro poor. Many Negroes are denied employment because of prejudice. White people have tried to keep Negroes near the bottom of the social ladder by denying them also of civil liberties. All factors have contributed to leaving many Negroes in a state of poverty. Apathy keeps the poor people poor. Apathy, by middle class people and by the government in failing to do any constructive work for extending educational opportunities, for example, to the poor, to a greater degree.

SOKOLOWSKI, DOROTHY - cont'd.

Automation has created many poor people. People have not only been put out of work but they have been left in work settlements where there is no employment.

All the factors mentioned have in some way contributed to the system of poverty in America. There are also many other factors too numerous and too complex to mention.

STAUFFER, MARCUS

Essay #1

"Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U.S.?"

In the Bible it states that "The poor will always be with us." When we examine this question it isn't enough to realize that there is a section of our populace that is always poor. We must try to see why are they poor.

Looking at one major poverty pocket - the Appalacian Region, we can see that initially there poverty came from technological advances. This region 's main industry is coal mining. In the late 1940's many coal mines were automated to cut costs. Due to this automation many people were unemployed. This was the start of real poverty in this area. The second blow came when other fuels were substituted for coal. In many areas such items as oil, gas, electricity and atomic power replaced coal as a souree of energy. When this took place many more men were put out of work becasue of the decline in demand for coal. Thus we can see that in this particular instance technological advancements were the initial cause for poverty.

However, this loss of jobs was only a starting point towards chronic poverty. With the loss of jobs they also lost political power. The lost political power becuase when they were employed they not only had the power of their own vote but they also had the powerful union lobbyists working for them. Butwith the loss of jobs they lost their lobbyists, who could force congressmen to take interest in their area. So the second phase in this case is that with the loss of jobs came the loss of political power.

The third and final stage in this area's decline to chronic poverty was the loss of initiative. Most of these people have only an elemtntary education, which ahs equiped them to cope with certain sitatuion. When they lost their jobs and then their union power they felt that therewas nothing taht they could do so they resigned themselves to the idea of being unemployed. In short they no longer cared or had any initiative.

In summary then we can see that in this one particular area that poverty was a three fold process. Technological advancements caused a loss of jobs. With this loss of jobs came political impotency. And finally with this loss of political power they lost their initiative which locked them in a dungeon of poverty. (time)

Essay #2

Why are there poor people in a rich country like the U.S.?

ø When I tried to answer this question at the beginning of the course I thought I understood the problem of poverty in the United States. Inthe last six weeks I have come to see that

STAUFFER, MARC (con't)

there are a multitude of aspects pertaining to poverty. WE have only started to explore them and there are many things we have yet to realize. What I have realized is this:

There is an economic problem. Our economy encourages selfishness and through this the poor are neglected.

There is a psychologicalaspect: In this area we have robbed the poor of dignity which tends to keep them poor.

Politically, there is the power structure. THose people who are organized can make the government pay attention to their own interests: the poor are unorganized and are therefore neglected.

The three above examples are only three very _isolated_ facotrs. This problem is extremely wide and diverse. To list and examine _all_ the factors would take a lifetime and several million of these booklets. Suffice it to say the three factors above are important but so are many other aspects. So I will conclude by saying that 99% of the time the poor are poor through no fault of their own. The system serves to keep them poor. I realize this only touches the surface but after all, we students only have scratched the surface in the last six weeks and still have a long way to go before we will be able to give an answer of more than limited depth.

STOTT, RICHARD

Essay 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U.S.?

What is meant by poor people in the United States? There are many definitions. If we define the poor as the lower 10% income group, the answer to the question seems a bit simple. People aren't all going to make the same amount of money, so of course there will be a lower 10%. But in cur society the lowest income could be $12,000, but it isn't, it is nowhere near that, it is much lower.

Why then cannot everyone be wealthy as middle class. People are different. Their backgrounds are different, some are more ambitious than others, however it would be unfair to say thatall poverty in the United States is due to laziness or lack of initiative. The old adage than any man can be president just isn't true. A $2,000 a year Negro working in Harlem can't make $100,000 a year simply by hard work. Background of these people plays an important part. A man whose father earned $1,000 will find $2,500 to be quite a fine sum.

Once a man becomes poor, either becuase of laziness or background there is little way up as I have said. A man who is born into a poor family finds it extremely hard to make good money. But in the beginning the responsibility must usually be laid on the person himself. But today the children of the poor don't have much of chance. Most poor people are born in poor families.

So I feel that the main reason for poverty today in the United States is to be born in a background of poverty. THis doesn't really get to the heart of the problem why were there poor people in the first place, but I believe this is the major reason why there are. TIME

Essay 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society?

A basic reason why there are poor people is because these people have traits which our society does not reward. Some are lazy, some have trouble obeying authority and most don't understand the ways to get "up the ladder" in our society. Some lack intelligence. Some poor do understand how one might make good but can't for reasons I'll discuss later.

What are the reasons why they are this way? The main answer is environment, the "culture" of the poor breeds poor. Coming from a very poor neighborhood these people are not totally aware of how to make good in our society. These are the ones most of us like to think of when we think of the poor becuase it rests the blame on them. They exist - but they're probably a minority.

The most common poor are those whose skills are no

STOTT, RICHARD (con't)

longer needed. Or those who are Negroes, Puerto Ricans or others with dark skins.

Technological unemployment, not only in the sense of the extremely skilled workers whose job has been taken by a machine, but in the more common sense of small farmers who can no longer compete with the market prices, and have no other skills, or miners whose mine has closed down, is a cause of poverty.

The Negroes also make up a large percentage of the poor. One half of the Negroes in the United States are estimated to be poor. They cannot get the better jobs because the color of their skin and becuase this discrimination over a long period of time has build a vicious circle of poverty.

A large per centage of the poor do have skills to "make it". But many of these are held down by the social structure, Negroes especially. It is extremely hard for a person who comes from a slum to move up. This is illustrated by the situation in Chicago where the lower-middle class has been rioting to protest lower-class Negroes trying to move into their neighborhood. It's hard tomove up for those who want to. A college Education such a big factor tosuccess today, has long been denied to Negroes without them being able to do anything about it.

If there are 40-50 million poor in America, why don't the rich do something about it. The main reason is the don't want to. The poor are hard to see for most, and many don't want to see them. It seems to me that the idea that whose who are poor deserve it, is dying. Today people just don;t care about the poor because it has nothing to do with them directly. They're ok so why worry about anyone else. After all, the poor are a decreasing (!) minority.

If no one else wants to do anything about the poor why don't they try to change the situation so they can elimanate the ghettoes and make it easier to become a success.

The reasonfor this is that poor don't know now and really don't care. THey want to rise in the society but organizing them is hard because they split into so many splinter groups. (Whites, Negroes, upper-lower, lower-lower, etc_ that nobody can organize between groups to get enough power to affect a change.

They don't know how to change, even when they do organize becuase they are constantly meant with resistance from the upper class power groups which control our society.

TIERNEY, ANN MARIE

ESSAY # 1

The American society is not and should not be regarded as the ultimate society of man. It is however a reasonably well-off society in comparison with the rest of the world. But like any other society in the world it has poverty and it's poor. Why are there poor people in a rich society like America? Does the fault or blame fall on the system or the people?

The social system, the poor vs. the rest of the society is full of faults. Unfortunately no one has come up with a better solution of why it (poverty) should exist. In America there should be an awareness of the fact that poverty exists and exists in some parts of the country to an extremely great extent. The poor often go unrecognized as being poor. In Appalachia for example the beauty of nature often hides the ugliness of poverty Also a great percentage of poor are over 65 and therefore have no means to check their poverty

Ultimately the material for finding an answer lies in people themselves. Some people will continue to be poor no matter how much opportunity is offered to them, others become rich through one chance. In order to find an answer, one must look at people for there is where one of the roots of poverty is.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

A problem such as the poor in America is nearly impossible to answer. As the course pointed out, this problem of poverty is entirely too complex to be realized fully by presenting this question from the point of several fields of study, the problem takes on many new aspects. The sociologist, psychologist, economist and political scientist each have some of the answers to the question. When the answers are brought out, they created more questions.

The sociologist looks at society norms and patterns, the economist the distribution of money, the question of who makes money for what, and how this affects poverty. The political scientist sees that the poor is not represented in American political system and whether they have the same chance for justice as the middle class. The psychologist sees man's tendencies, the way other men and society have instilled his notion and reactions toward poverty.

Society is made for the middle class and it's morality. The money is distributed among this and upper class and the poor are often never reached. The government programs never reach the real poverty. The middle class children are taught indirectly to misrepresent or ignore the problem of poverty. Unless we can change the attitude of awareness to this problem of poverty in the United States, the problem will not go past the "paper" stage.

TIKKANEN, NANCY

ESSAY # 1

The existence of poor people in the United States is a result of many factors, plus the striking contrast with the so-called affluence around them. Being "poor" has economic, cultural, and other social connotations.

As society has become more and more devoted to technological expansion, increasing numbersof workers have been required. At the beginning of this rapid industrialization, Americans were employed. However, foreigners, hearing of the promise of wealth and freedom in the U. S., began to arrive and fill these jobs. They were more or less mobile, they knew little or no English. Moreover, they brought with them their own folkways and mores which were different from those which they were to encounter. These immigrants, in that whether they held on to their old customs and morals, or whether they adapted to the faster, more pragmatic world, would succeed (or live not in debt) or become poor people.

Similarly we have the city slum-dwellers who can be considered "poor people." I am speaking in regards to the Negroes, and Puerto Ricans. They have not had the educational backgrounds that would allow them to leave the squalor of the slums. Thus, they are a static portion of society. The absence of a father in many of the families creates financial and social problems.

While the industrialization and emphasis on technology in the U.S. have brought vast wealth, this wealth issomewhat top-heavy. The lower classes have remained where they were in social status (derived from income, basically). Calling the U.S. a rich society is to account for only an average. This average...

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U. S.?

Poor people exist in the U. S. and will continue to exist until the "vicious circle" of poverty isbroken. Being surrounded by an environment which allows no escape (as the situation stands), each generation falls into the same rut as their parents.

The wall which separates the poor from the non-poor is built of education, modern social standards, housing, and food. The educational facilities provided for slum areas are usually minimal, and the teachers are far from the best. Adding to the bad attitude toward school are the parents. They want their children to go out and work to add to the family's fesources instead of wasting time with books. The poor are still primarily concerned with the struggle for survival, whereas the rest of society worries what to do with it's surpluses. In effect the poor and non-poor live in tow different social structures, but supposedly in the same society.

The prevalence of organization among the non-poor in politics, business, religion, etc. lets them progress rapidly, bringing about real social change to themselves. Since they are involved with the running of the system, progress will be toward goals which have been adopted by this "hierarchy." Though, until recently, "progress" was toward any number of goals set up by powerful individuals, the action affected the whole society. The creation of a system to produce (relatively) cheap luxuries for some people to squander their excess profits on seems an anachronism when many other people idd not have enough money to provide themselves with decent housing and enough food to survive. But as the rich got richer, the poor got poorer - relatively, because the standards are changed by those in power.

The poor cannot escape their place in society, because they do not have the "socially acceptable" means to overcome their plight. Without the power of inner organization, plus an outward power structure, they cannot begin to alleviate their condition. Andunless something is done to alleviate their condition they will become more and more a blight on society as a whole.

THOMPSON, FRANCES

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

Although the U.S.'s economy is booming, approximately forty million Americans are not enjoying the benefits of this economic condition. These forty million people are poor.

Poverty in the United States is not restricted to a specific area. You can find this condition in New York, Boston, and any other major city. The poor also reside in small villages or towns. Consequently, poverty is a problem for all of America.

To me, poverty is the by-product of any prospering society. As Emerson stated in his essay, "Compensation, with the good there is the sour." Thus, poverty is the sour grape of the prosperous American society.

Automation, which has enabled our economy to augment rapidly has also been a factor in poverty. Today, machines are constantly replacing men and women in the factory and/or the office. The persons who are usually replaced are twenty-year and thirty-year veterans of that job. Since these people have performed the same job so long they find it difficult to train themselves for another one. In addition, many firms will not hire them because they are in their late forties or early fifties. Eventually these unemployed people join the ranks of the American poor.

Another factor in the American society which cause poverty is a lack of education. Today, education is quite integral for all. Thus, if one lacks a good education or has never received any formal education, he or she has little chance of obtaining a good job. Generally, such persons become migrant farmers, moonshiners, and cotton pickers among other unskilled laborers.

As you can readily perceive, poverty is a condition that is stimulated by the economic gains of a nation.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U. S.?

The U. S. of America, the most powerful and affluent nation in the world today, has approximately 50 million people , one-fourth of it's population living in conditions that are an outrage to human decency. Although the U. S. has the highest standard of living, one-fourth of it's population does not share this economic state. The reason for this condition lies in the structure of the U. S.

The U. S.'s economy is presently booming. Large corporations, such as General Motors, have been making unprecedented profits. American consumers are pruchasing more goods than ever before. Amid all this affluence and prosperity 50 million Americans are living amid poverty.

These 50 million poor people are not within the realms of the American mainstream. The economy doesn't need them as laborers or consumers. Thus, they are forced to remain in impoverished.

Another cause for poverty in the U. S. is the innate attitude of Congress to assist the poor in overcoming their economic plight.

The Congress of the U. S. isn't representative of the American people. Instead, this national legislature reacts to the pressure of interests groups. Since these groups are primarily concerned with their own needs, they pressure Congressmen to allocate as much money as possible to programs that are beneficial to the interest groups. Also, these lobbyists are selective in the people they want their programs to assist. Most of the time they exclude the poor.

Thus, the poor are not aided by the one national body that should respond to their condition.

One of the main reasons for the existence of poverty in the U.S. is apathy or ignorance on the part of the American public.

Many Americans, particularly the middle and upper class, do not come into contact with the poor. These people generally live in exclusive suburbs, where everyone is of the same economic class. When these people come to the metropolis, they go to the better places in the city and do not see the slums.

Thus, the people who are capable of helping the poor are unaware of their very existence.

Thus, the poor are the victims of the prospering American society. Since we do not need them, most people would like to believe they do not exist.

TRIER, DANA

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U. S. A.?

The greatest portion of the blame for poverty in contemporary United States lies in the false social standards, inhibiting laws, and lack of sufficient regulation of the capitalist system and competitive market; however, there still remains room for improvement of these old detrimental conditions. Because of these factors, many people were thrust into poverty and, as their educational and vocational opportunities were drastically reduced, they have fallen into a vicious cycle of poverty.

A high percentage of today's poverty stricken are Negroes as a result of the unfair social practices and laws initiated in the nineteenth century. Negroes were not allowed ample educational opportunities for a long time; and, a result, their vocational opportunities were limited. Furthermore, employment discrimination was widespread. As a result of several factors, including discrimination and their low living standard, Negroes gathered to live in ghettos. This segration further inhibited their economic advance.

At least in the North to a certain extent, many of these destructive social practices and laws have been done away with. But Negro population has often been so far behind that advancement is a slow process.

A long standing belief in "Social Darwinism" has caused the rest of the society to be slow in their response to the problem of the minority groups and to the generally lower living standards of the laboring class. This theory proposes that the "fittest survive" and it is only Nature's course to dispose with the weaker members as the economic society eventually evolves into a perfectone. The viewpoint has been, in fact, bleak for much of society throughout the "central tradition of economic thought" as Galbraith calls it.

Many of these ideas have changed now with the gradual resistance of the poorer themselves playing an important role. Now, the problem is how to pull the afflicted out of the vicious cycle they are in.

ESSAY # 2

There are several conditions and factors that have caused poor people to exist in a rich society like the United States.

Among those factors are those inherent in our economic system. First, because of technological advance and the inevitable tendency toward monopoly that accompanies it in some industries, the people employed in naturally competitive industries like agriculture, textiles, etc. have suffered at the hands of the profit maximizers and strong unions in the other industries. Second, since higher profits and not greater social benefits is the objective of businessmen, people sometimes suffer because of "profitable" moves on the part of the firms. For instance, many people and many towns are left rather impoverished when the largest employer in the area leaves for a more profitable location. Third, although "countervailing" powers play a significant role in offsetting the power of big businesses, some groups, such as farm laborers, cannot, by their nature, be effective as a countervailing power and are therefore subject to the interests of others.

TRIER, DANA - cont'd.

I actually think the lack of "social consciousness" inherent in our system is underlying rationale should take much responsibility for poor people. Furthermore, the real poor have not been able to achieve sufficient recognition or power within our political system. One reason is that money is a prerequisite for power; and, of course, the poor do not possess it. Moreover, again we see the inability of poor to unite into a strong interest group. This inability maybe attributed to their diversity. But we have seen some cases of unity lately in the ghettoes in large urban centers. Another reason for the poor is lack of power in our political system is the fact that they are not represented proportionally. Because of this country's delay in re-apportionment, the rural areas has greater in Congress than urgan areas in proportion to their population. We often see lack of sufficient priority given by the President. One major cause is the manner in which the President is elected. In order to become elected, he must satisfy and comply with the interests of the major power groups, big business, etc. These power groups of course are not interested in the poor; and the President must pay attention first to the interest of these groups before he can turn his attention to the poor. Furthermore, it is often the case that a man must be more interested in achieving power and sustaining it just by nature to become a President. It must be pointed out, furthermore, that the President, even if he were interested, would be handicapped by other forces upon him. A final point that must mentioned when dealing with the political power of the poor, is the lack of voting rights by Negroes for many years in the South. This condition has resulted in conservatives being elected time after time in the South.

Psychological factors have also played a major role in making and keeping people poor in the United States. First, many people in the upper and middle classes believe that the poor are poor because they are born lazy or are naturally stupid. Although this misconception has many of it's roots in the underlying assumptions of our economic system and in Social Darwinism, many people really have what seems to be a good reason to believe these things; because the poor do look lazy and seem or are stupid. But when we study why they are poor or why they are "stupid," we see another major reason why the poor keep poor, their environment makes them. First, the poor often are depressed, because they see little chance for any significant deal of upper mobility or real benefit from working hard. Second, because their parents (in the case of second or third generation poor) are very uneducated, there is little educational stimulation in the home. Moreover, the poor are often products of matriarchal families (their existence can also be traced to the low-income earning ability of the father). And in the ghettoes where they often live the kids exert a very punishing influence on them.

A second reason for the lack of beneficial attitude on the part of the higher classes is the general trend toward necrophylia. This condition is due to several factors (which can not be dealt with in detail in this paper.)

In closing I would like to say that I actually know a heck of a lot more but I don't feel very good this morning.

WOLCOTT, LAWRENCE

ESSAY # 1

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the U. S. A.?

While the question of the existance of poor people in our society is one of the most complex questions to ask concerning our society, I believe that the basic cause lies with the structure of our government, and economy . Our form of society permits individuals to basically control their own actions. This freedom, then, results in a division of our society into three classes; the rich, the middle and the poor, because of many different circumstances. People with ambition and ability become part of the upper and middle class while people who lack ambition, initiative and capability become part of the lower, or poor, class. Of course this is not the entire answer. Many people are unable to break the bonds of ghettos and ignorance and raise from poverty even if the desire too.

I also believe that the existance of the three basic classes, thus the existance of poor people, is the sign of a healthy society. The homogeneous society of Marx would not be possible because it would remove incentive to achieve and to gain, and would destroy itself. In a healthy society although there is opportunity to work and achieve, in a capitalistic sense, there is also , conversely, opportunity to "sink into the depths of poverty," and, with a basic difference among people, some will "choose" this course.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

Six weeks ago I came to this course convinced that there was one, and only one, main reason for the existance of poverty. I thought that poor people existed because they were too lazy to work, to raise themselves from their plight. It would be the highest hypocrisy for me to say that I now know the answer to this problem. From this course I have found out that there is no one set answer. There is an incredibly complex set of answers. Basically the poverty stricken in the U. S. are beset by an economic, political, and psychological plight which tends to from a vicious circle, each factor seeming to act as both a cause and effect.

The people are in a terrible economic plight, many of them below even a subsistence level. Because of their poverty, they do not have political power in our society, in which money is the criterion for political power. Because they do not have political power they can do nothing to raise their economic status. Because of their economic plight and lack of power to do anything about it, psychological factors develop which lead the circle around and cause the people imvolved to become almost apathetic to their conditions, for example, or causes a matriarchal society develop for the poverty stricken. In other words these psychological factors further aggravate the political and economic situation further driving these people into poverty.

This is just a basic outline of the problem. I do not feel competent to make any greater analysis. This basic understanding, though, is a start, a step, in the right direction to further understanding and most of all, a cure for the conditions of poverty in the United States.

WOLFORD, JAMES

ESSAY # 1

In my opinion it is impossible to have a pure rich society. There are always people that will be poor regardless of what is done for them. There always people that are oppressed by others and as a result they can not make a decent living.

There are many more reasons than the two that I have mentioned. I am going to concentrate on the first of my two reasons. I think some people enjoy being poor. Some people get many breaks and chances to succeed, but they do not follow through on them. They are satisfied to receive just enough money from welfare to get along. There is enough money and wealth in the United States so that everyone could be well off. This would be an ideal situation which is impossible. Some people are born to be rich and some are born to be poor. Regardless of how money is distributed among them, it will eventually end up in the hands of the some few. By this I mean that there will be a certain few that will always be rich and a certain few that will be poor. I am disregarding the average man in the middle class majority. There will always be those that do well enough but never become rich.

I don't know if I have made my point or not but I believe that some people will be poor despite the best opportunities in the world.

ESSAY # 2

Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?

During the last six weeks, I have been able to see the complexity of this question. I still don't know if I am capable of presenting any feasible answers. The more I have learned about hhis problem, the harder it has become to answer it.

First of all, I have realized that there are many reasons for and solutions to the problem. Any one solution might help a little, but they all must work in harmony if anything significant is to be accomplished.

From my research paper, I have learned that one of the reasons for the existence of poor people is the failure of the welfare program to help the poor people who need helping. This is mainly because they have no political power.

Most of the political power today is held (but not always controlled) by the middle class. Throughout the course it has become evident to me that many middle class persons don't know or don't care about the existence of such terrible poverty in the country. If the middle class become aware of the problem and decided to do something about it, we could probably solve the poverty program.

There are so many causes and solutions for poverty that I can't possibly write them now.

The main reasons, in my mine, why there are poor people in a rich society like the U. S. are:

1) Apathy of middle and upper classes.
2) Lack of political power of the poor.
3) Lack of efficient welfare program and
4) The necessity of a poverty class to keep our system going as it is now.

Now that I havetaken this course and gained some insight into the problem, I think I will better be able to evaluate the different reasons for poverty, and in the same sense to evaluate other problems in our society and throught the world. This course has taught me to look at a problem critically and study the different aspects of it before passing judgment.

WRIGHT, TRELLIS

ESSAY # 1

Why are people poor in a rich society like the U.S.A.?

The United States of America is rich, having vast resources and indefinable wealth, however, a number of people are poor. It seems odd that such a great land which has experimented with poverty programs cannot find a result. One reason for the number of poor people is the structure of the government, namely capitalism. While its better than other systems, capitalism necessarily has rich, middle, and poor classes. If poor people could have more educational, social, and cultural advances, maybe they could rise to the middle class. Not only would they enjoy their newly acquired wealth.

ESSAY # 2

Why there are poor people in arrich society like the U.S.

Poor people are impoverished in the U. S. for a variety of reasons. First, economic reasons have tended to keep people down. The fact that one-fifth of the country's population have a large per cent of the income, and how to get the money into the hands of the poor is confusing.

Moreover, from a political scientist's point of view, the government has done little to help those distressed. To begin with, not much legislation to help the poor has been passed. Due to many reasons, one of them no re-apportionment, the power of state legislatures lays in the hand of a small, rural population. Thus, representatives who are chosen to Congress will protect the interests of these people, namely the rural population, who elected them. They will seldom, if ever, "pull-for" bills or acts allotting any reasonable sum to poverty programs.

Also, some psychological factors on the issue can be discussed. For example, the people who are already poor blame themselves for their condition. Thus they consider themselves failures and bums. Yet, they are not the primary reasons for their condition. It is, in fact, the system in which they live. In addition, a poor family can create unneccessary barriers in itself which hinder the making of a solution to the problem. A mother's insistence that her son is "no-good" makes him feel inferior. If he marries and has any marital discord, he rather than being ridiculed, deserts. Now, the family is fatherless, the mother starts the same routine on her son, and the cycle repeats itself.

Finally, one of the most difficult problems that the poor have is the middle class. One reason is that the poor class has middle class values, they are constantly striving to reach the middle class, but the average Americans income group will try to keep the poor down. Some of the middle class people had ascended from the lower class, and they want to protect their newly acquired wealth. These alreedy in the middle class are trying to reach the upper class, and they are not concerned with the problem.

In conclusion, there are poor people in the U. S. for a number of reasons. No one reason will answer the questions. No two or three answers will answer the question. If this were possible the findings of the Social Science A group would solve it.

The Cornell Experimental Introductory Course in the Social Sciences - A Psychologist's Report

by Michael Maccoby

For five days last January, a group of university and college teachers met at Rutgers under the auspices of the U.S. Office of Education, Educational Services, Inc., and the National Science Foundation to plan new methods of introducing college students to the social sciences. What brought us together was the shared conviction that present methods of teaching economics, sociology, political science, and psychology either bury the undergraduate's interest in understanding man and society beneath a mass of description cloaked in jargon, or force the student to concern himself with specialized interests of his professors at the cost of developing critical and theoretical abilities to examine questions of social and historical importance. Furthermore, introducing the social sciences through one of its branches alone fosters the illusion that there is an economic or psychological solution to social problems, rather than leading the student to understand the interrelationship between the various forces that determine social behavior.

Some of us were expecially struck by the contrast between the tendency of the social sciences to deaden and mechanize its concepts of man and society as compared to modern physics and biochemistry where paradoxically the subject matter becomes increasingly more alive. By alienating the social sciences from the deepest social questions and by focusing on aspects of life ripped from their human context, trivialities and mechanical models masquerade as science.

The participants at the Rutgers conference agreed that the social sciences should be taught differently, but not all of us interpreted the problem in the same way. Some were concerned by the student protests at Berkeley which they felt would spread to other colleges and which reflected student dissatisfaction with the alienation of teaching from student concerns. Others reasoned that student dissatisfaction stemmed more from neglect by professors, preoccupied by their own research and consulting, who paid little attention to their teaching obligations. According to this view, the fault lay more with overly busy professors than with the social sciences. They suggested that both teachers and students might be more interested by an interdisciplinary course at the intersticies of the various social sciences, without an explicit attempt to integrate points of view. For ecample, a historian, a city planner, and a sociologist might present a course on the city, giving the student a chance to sample the fruits of the individual investigations.

The merit of this approach is that it could attract distinguished scholars to communicate their passion for understanding to beginning students, but such a course would not necessarily encourage the students to analyze either social issues or conventional opinions. It might end up with more high level description of the history of cities, of planning, of social classes, without ever confronting the forces that determine the evolution of real cities or the human results of affluence and poverty, of the structure of political power, etc. in cities. A student who is unhappy with modern cities, who is disturbed by poverty and racial violence in cities, might never begin to learn why cities are as they are and what must change if they are to be different. By focusing on a method to engage high-powered teachers in undergraduate education, the content of the social sciences is taken for-granted, and while such a course might improve undergraduate teaching at great universities such as Berkeley and Harvard, it would generate no response at colleges and universities which lack the star-system.

A second group at Rutgers felt that the key to engaging the student, to preserving and developing his interest in studying man was to help him to analyze himself. Such an introductory course would be oriented to psychology, sociology and possibly to literature. Students would be encouraged to talk about their own experiences in high school, in their families, in work, and at play, and to see their own lives in scientific perspective. The students might also do practical field work in mental hospitals or social betterment projects, carrying their experiences back to the classroom for analysis. The major criticism of this approach is that it can easily become intrusive rather than educational. The college student is passing through a period of adolescence when he is intensely preoccupied with himself and his identity. He seeks intellectual skills and craves competence to bridge the gap between his separation from childhood and his need for a more mature relatedness to the world around him. While he is eager to understand his insecurity and unrest, concentrating exclusively on personal experiences risks either over-intellectualizing them or encouraging a regressive dependence on the teacher who is not equipped to respond. Unlike the patient in psychoanalysis, the student cannot expect the instructor to have the knowledge, time, and patience to guide him through his fears and resistances. A course based on analyzing the student, if it is at all profound, is something like a surgical operation in which the patient is left to sew himself up as best he can. At best such a course might be attempted by an exceptionally gifted professor, but it is hardly a general model for an introductory course in the social sciences.

At third point of view expressed at Rutgers urged that students be trained to change society, that they be introduced to the social sciences in terms of liberal social action. The criticisms of such a course are both obvious and not so obvious. First of all, it is hard to imagine such training without indoctrination. But even if students were encouraged to change society in any way they wished, there is no guarantee that they would learn anything about the forces that form society. Their attempts at change would likely be motivated by either naive illusions or aggressive rebelliousness. It seemed to me that those teachers who wished to use the classroom as a laboratory in liberal politics had little faith in the theory and methods of the social sciences as a means of understanding the difference between powerful economic, political, social and psychological forces as contrasted with the behavioral or symptomatic results of those forces. Rather, they nursed the mystical faith of a disillusioned middle age that the younger generation, without training or knowledge, would know better than their elders what could and should be changed in our society.

The four of us who organized the Cornell course shared a dissatisfaction with the other alternative suggestions as well as a radical critique of the social sciences as they are now taught and practiced. Before discussing our point of view, let me briefly describe the four participants. The economist is Douglas F. Dowd, who organized the Rutgers conference and became the course director. Dowd is a professor at Cornell, an economist who although familiar with the current mainstream of micro-economics identifies with the tradition of Thorstein Veblen who was also at war with his own discipline and concerned with making economic theory relevant to understaniing man and society, and not merely business cycles and fiscal policy. The sociologist is Sister Marie Augusta Neal, S.N.D., the chairman of the Sociology Department at Emmanuel College in Boston, a graceful woman who directs her sociological analysis to questions of social change both within and outside of the Catholic Church. Although something of a feminist, Sister Marie's ecumenical spirit seeks community, in the social sciences, in religion, and among all men and women of good will. The political scientist, John Rensenbrink, teaches at Bowdoin College and before going to Maine spent two years studying political institutions in East Africa. Rensenbrink's main interest is analyzing the political forces of the past and the present that block or allow men to experience freedom within the structure of society. I am a social psychologist, like Sister Marie trained at Harvard's department of Social Relations, but also trained as a psychoanalyst by Erich Fromm in Mexico where I have spent six years studying Mexican peasants and where I now teach and practice psychoanalysis. My central interest is studying the relationship between human motivation and the social and economic forces that mould character. As a psychoanalyst interested in education, I am particularly concerned with the problem of stimulating students to become aware of the difference between intellectualized, alienated knowledge and the understanding that comes from experience, systematic investigation, and authentic interest.

All of us felt that an introductory course in the social sciences must be constructed in terms of content that engaged the student and pedagogical methods which encouraged him to be critical about his own perceptions and opinions and about what we as his teachers told him. With this in mind we drafted the following principles as the basis for the course:

A. The social sciences aspire to accuracy of analysis, interpretation, and prediction, and yet deal with the human person. This implies dimensions over and above the order and randomness of the data treated by the physical sciences.

Human beings are alive, which means that they are constantly changing, in transition from the past to the future. This change is a process acted upon by economic, political, social, and psychological forces. Yet, man is also unique in the sense that he can become conscious of the forces acting upon him and he can influence them, which means that he can be morally responsible for them and therefore for their result which is he himself. For this reason, it is desirable that human problems as they are now in the process of being lived be the central focus of the teaching of the social sciences, so that both student and scholar deepen their awareness of the interrelationship between knowledge and decision.

B. The humanities and the social sciences both consider human experience but face it from a differnt perspective and with different methods. They share the free use of imagination along with the necessity of uncritical modes of subjective interpretation. They also share the possibility of going beyond common sense concepts and cultural stereotypes to a more accurate perception of reality by a critical examination of appearances. The humanist analyzes by critically examining his own response, while the scientist must produce systematic interpretations which stand the test of generalized criteria. Thus, the interaction of student and social scientist must have built into it the student's effort to demand from the scientist proof and demonstration.

C. Because the social sciences study social relations in which men in their daily lives are culturally embedded and because they deal with them in their changing forms with historical perspective and future projections, it is difficult for the student and the scholar to gain objective perspective on the object of analysis. He must learn to become aware to the degree that his way of seeing is influenced by cultural stereotypes, ideology, and categories of consciousness. For this reason, it is desirable that from the beginning of his experience with the social sciences the student develop his motivation and skill in discriminating reality from the convention and the illusory. Traditional courses in the social sciences do not effectively focus on either motivation or skill in the introductory course.

D. Because the proposed experiment takes the form of an interdisciplinary course, it must take cognizance of both the possibilities and the dangers in such a format. If the possibilities of genuine interaction among participating scholars are to be realized, there must be a dialogue among the social scientists in each teaching session of the course - a dialogue that involves not only hearing the others out, but each responding to the others actively in the classroom, where the students can both hear and speak. One of the dangers of such an approach, that it could lead to confusion and analytical chaos, requires new methods for preserving direction, capturing new insights, and incorporating them into the developing framework and content.

At Rutgers, the four of us outlined our approaches to the course question, and from February to July we wrote each other to suggest readings and to comment on the themes that each of us would present. For a while it seemed that the U. S. Office of Education was not going to support the course, spirits fell and the participants began to make other plans. When the course was finally approved in late May, much of the organization and integration of the four approaches remained to be done. In fact, we discovered that the course demanded constant reorganization of thought and analysis, that the teachers themselves had to listen closely to their colleague's lectures, changing and re-writing their own presentations to take into account fresh insights and ideas from other disciplines that challenged our separate assumptions.

The pedagogical technique of the course stimulated requestioning on the part of the professors. The course lasted six weeks, with classes Monday through Friday. The day began at nine with an hour lecture, followed by a half-hour discussion of the lecture, which while open to student questions was meant to serve primarily as a dialogue between the four professors, who would point out disagreements, if any, but more important how each separate discipline in its form of analysis excluded or oversimplified factors central to another discipline. For example, Rensenbrink, the political scientist, in discussing political power, pointed out that the white collar class votes with the upper middle class, even though its economic interest lies with the working class. Sister Marie, the sociologist, then called attention to the aspirations of the white collar class, to its reference group, to studies showing that the white collar group seeks to be accepted by the upperclasses and tries to copy its behavior. This discussion paved the way for my own lecture on child socialization and its relation to forming the character or motivational structure in the child that best guarantees him success in the economic system.

Dialogue between the professors also showed the students that we encouraged and expected them to be critical of us. If we criticized other points of view, the students might and hopefully would turn our techniques against us and force us to consider alternative hypotheses and explanations.

After the lecture and dialogue, there was a half hour break, followed by an hour section led by graduate teaching assistants. There were 53 students in the course, less than we had hoped, since the late decision to present the course meant that many potential students had already made plans for the summer. What we had in mind was a course that could be given to large numbers of students, to serve as an introductory course at big universities. For this reason, even though the professors might have led the sections, we held to the plan of using teaching assistants, in order to construct a model for a larger course. The three sections, composed of 18 or 19 students, were led by graduate students in economics, political science, and psychology, from Cornell who in their own doctoral research had developed an interest in questions relating to poverty. The sections were to discuss the lectures and the readings, and after the mid-point of the course, the individual research papers which were required from each student in place of a final examination.

The decision to require papers instead of an examination grew from the aim of stimulating self-directed interest, and of confronting the tendency to learn only what is necessary to pass tests. The students were told that grading would be either pass or fail, and a grade of pass depended mainly on the seriousness of the student, as evidenced from his attendance, participation, and attempt to explore in his paper a question that interested him, taking into account his teachers' suggestions and the lectures in writing his paper. He should feel no compulsion to agree with his professors, but he should feel obliged to be aware of what they had said.

Besides the lectures and sections, the schedule varied on Wednesday mornings and Thursday evenings. On Wednesday, the group broke into smaller sections of eight, led by a professor or teaching assistant, to discuss in detail individual books, including Poverty in America, by Michael Harrington; Erich Fromm's Escape from Freedom; Rich Man, Poor Man, by Herman Miller, a book on income distribution in the United States; Gideon's Trumpet by Anthony Lewis, a book that describes the ability of a poor man to gain a successful hearing before the Supreme Court with the result that the poor in general can claim the right of counsel before any court in the United States; and Elmstown's Youth by August Hollingshead, an analysis of social class and its effect on students and teachers, on aspirations and popularity, in a midwestern high school. On Thursday evenings, movies, both documentaries and feature films, on aspects of poverty were shown with discussions following, led by Eugene Lichtenstein who served as evaluator of the course from the U.S. Office of Education, and who is a documentary filmmaker in his own right. Of the movies shown, five were noteworthy in adding depth in the subjects treated in the course, and in demonstrating that a sensitive eye and scientific analysis can combine to illuminate underlying truth. The documentaries included two C.B.S. reports, "Harvest of Shame" which studied migrant workers and "Sixteen in Webster Groves" which studied affluent high school students. Another documentary, "Football" produced by Time Inc. clearly illustrated the clash in our society between humane values and the urge to win at any cost, even if this means brutalizing ourselves. The two feature films were Bunuel's "Los Olvidados" ("The Young and the Damned") about delinquent boys in Mexico and "The Cool World" with a similar theme shot in Harlem. This concludes the description of pedagogical technique, but it is worth adding that although attendance was never taken officially, it averaged about 90 percent.

With the exception of two upperclassmen who asked permission to attend, the students were pre-freshmen of the two institutions. Among the Cornell group were 12 Negroes from the Cornell disadvantaged students program, boys and girls from Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, Washington,D.C., and Birmingham, Alabama, whose low College Board scores would not ordinarily gain them entrance to Cornell. These students had been sent a special letter of invitation by Gloria Joseph, the teaching assistant in psychology, who directs, indeed mothers, the program. This group proved to be especially important to the course, not only because of their intimate knowledge of poverty in large city ghettoes, but also because they forced the white middle-class students to confront their glibness about poverty and the unexamined prejudices that hide behind an indifferent liberalism. For me personally, the Negro students were a revelation. I had not taught American undergraduates in six years and had never had the privilege of teaching the new generation of Negro youth who without any servility or fear and with some defiance demonstrate the possibility of different forms of intellectual excellence, other than the abstract, verbal fluency that we usually reward in universities and colleges.

What did the students, given their different backgrounds, varied education and abilities, learn from the course? One way of finding out is by examining their answers to the question of the course. On the second day of classes, students were handed blue books and asked to give their own idea of "Why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States?" On the last day, they were asked to answer the same question, (neither answer was graded), and the difference in answers is good indication of the course's success with the majority of students. Another measure is the quality of the individual papers, and a third is the way in which they began to discuss with their teachers and among themselves (sometimes far into the night) what they had learned about poverty in America, about the social sciences, and about themselves.

For most of the students, the course was felt as a challenge and a demand to wake up to aspects of their society and their own lives that they had seen but never before noticed. Once they woke up to their experience, it was possible to relate poverty to the economic system and to facts of income distribution, to unconscious motivation and character, to questions of political power, and to childhood socialization practices and the social class attitudes and definitions of reality that mould behavior. Waking-up demands a critical view of what they had taken for-granted, such as their own desires for the latest model car, or their excitement about buying new gadgets and clothes they did not need. Do all people share these desires? Are such desires necessary for a consumption society to operate? What attitudes would such desires, produced by advertising and social consensus, cause in the poor? And what about the students' own motives to gain success in school and work? Are these the same drives that motivate a peasant or a migratory worker? If not, what is it about the economic reality of a society which produces different motives in different societies? What is the result of the desire to do well, to achieve in our society? Does it lead to deep interest in knowing, to profound interpersonal relationships?

The students had never before considered themselves as having been formed by a particular society. Nor had they considered the human cost of their formation. If they had not seen themselves, the majority of white middle class adolescents had much less idea of the poor. One girl's experience with Negroes was limited to driving through the ghetto of her city "with the windows rolled up, so as to be safe." A Mid-Western boy refused to believe there were poor people or social classes in his home town. He left infuriated from Sister Marie's lecture on social class and wrote home to his mother asking her to tell the professor that he lived in a classless town. The mother wrote back to tell her son what had never been discussed at home, and she reminded him that he did not invite some boys to his parties and others did not invite him. The majority of the middle class students, like the majority of Americans, confidently wrote in their first answer that there were poor people because the poor were lazy or uneducated, victims of heredity or of parents who did not care or who were from foreign cultures that do not value education as highly as do Americans.

The middle-class students felt that the solution to poverty in America is obvious. All that is needed is better schools and teaching plus an injection of middle class virtues and aspirations into people who would rather accept relief than work. Their first answers were glib and self-confident, and they reflected the impatience of many Americans with the poverty program and with high taxation to benefit poor people who they felt were in great part responsible for their own poverty. During the course they became aware for the first time of who the poor are, the migrant workers, the Negroes, the workers displaced by automation, the old people, and the fatherless families. They learned that the poor fall outside of the heart of our economic system, that they are not needed to keep our economic plant running at full steam, nor is their consumption of goods and services beneficial economically. The students began to see that there are poor people who with a great will to work are unfitted to gain a decent wage in our society and are unable to give their children the opportunity to enter the great society. They became more aware of the powerlessness of the poor, politically as well as economically, and they began to see their own contempt for those who are weak and powerless. Indeed, they began to confront the fact that our own society based in consumption and efficiency turns human suffering into abstract problems, causing indifference to ones own feelings and to the reality of others. Their final blue books showed less sureness, but a sense of the complexity of the question and what must be known to answer it.

Even those students who had considered themselves liberals, who were in favor of government programs to "help them," were at first overly proud of their noblesse oblige. It angered them to think that the poor might not be grateful to receive, and they were worried that the poor people be given so much help that they would lose interest in helping themselves. In other words, the majority of middle class students viewed poverty in America as a problem in psychology and morals. They did not consider that the same economic and social forces which had made them rich had made others poor, and they did not see that eliminating poverty meant improving their society, that it was not a matter of being a "good guy" but one of being a responsible citizen whose own self interest in the deepest sense required concern with his environment. Instead, they believed that all are benefited when each member of society pursues his individual idol of material gain, and the obligation to those who fall by the wayside is charity wrapped in a sermon.

An unplanned factor in the course which proved as important as lectures and reading in challenging conventional attitudes to poverty was the presence of 12 students from Negro ghettoes. They had seen poverty and prejudice destroy hope for neighbors and relatives who tried desperately to find work, without success or only at subsistence wages. They had no illusions that education by itself would solve the problem of poverty, and it was no surprise for them to learn that a Negro with a college education can expect to make on the average as much as a white man graduated from the eight grade. But it took a while before the Negro students began participating in the course. While the white middle class students resisted the questioning of their conventionalism and virtuousness, the resistance of the Negroes lay in their suspiciousness of the professors as representatives of the white world. They feared that taking the course meant opening themselves to more of white's brainwashing or to his ridicule of their intellectual abilities. It was better to stay unnoticed. Some were willing to learn the skills for making it in the Ivy League, but they were troubled about betraying their origins and their friends. They resented it when white students carefully excepted them when making prejudiced generalizations about Negro laziness or violence. Unlike Negroes of another generation, these did not find pride in being "different."

One of the most rewarding results of the course for the professors was the eventual engagement of many Negro students who became slowly convinced that knowledge and analysis were relevant to better understanding their private experiences and for seeking a strategy to change the ghettoes. A few discovered that their very lack of abstract intellectual ability saved them from the tendency to intellectualize, to compartmentalize knowledge into formal and dead categories closed to experience. Much of their resistance to learning and their impotence in the face of multiple choice tests of the College Board variety were rooted in their bewilderment with knowledge that had no relation to their experience, that seemed purposeless and meaningless. Once they could respond to an intellectual question as an opportunity to transcend conventional wisdom, they were not only able but eager to learn. One Negro boy in his term paper describes a moment in the course when suddenly economics seemed to explain his own fears about the type of work he could look forward to and the kind of menial work that his brother was forced to accept. At that moment, he became interested and wanted to read more about capitalism and its alternatives.

For Pat, an attractive and quiet girl from Washington, the stimulation was a lecture I gave on the causes and effects of matriarchal families, drawing from both studies in the United States and my own work with Mexican peasants. The lecture was concerned first with the economic factors that allow women to work while men are deprived the opportunity to maintain their sense of dignity and the patriarchal role demanded by their culture. I went on to speak of the universal conflict between the sexes and the way in which women attack men with ridicule and men fight back with either physical force, economic power, or finally, when they feel defeated and impotent, by abandonment. Pat and others were for the first time able to see Negro men as victims, not only of economics and prejudice but also of women who were not as victimized as they believed. Pat went on to study the works of E. Franklin Frazier on the Negro family in the United States, the Moynihan report on matriarchy, and twelve other books and articles. In her paper she considered both the causes of Negro families either without fathers or with weak fathers and the possible government policies that might help change this condition, ranging from government jobs for Negro men to the encouragement of male Negro schoolteachers in the primary grades. It is a paper that would satisfy the requirements of a freshman course anywhere, but it would never have been written if the course had not spoken to Pat's own experiences.

A more dramatic educational experience was the awakening of Theo, a very quiet and reserved football star from Bedford-Stuyvesant, to his own intellectual insight and understanding. We had just finished the showing of "Los Olvidados" and begun discussion about the film. One sequence in the picture is a dream. The dreamer is a boy of 12 or 13 who lives with his mother and younger brothers and sisters. The mother resents the boy, blaming him for the father's betrayal and abandonment of her. She demands that the boy earn his own living and refuses to give him either the food or affection he craves. Despite his wish to be warm and loving, the boy is drawn into a delinquent gang. One night he dreams that his mother finally listens to his plea to give him something to eat. In the dream she gets up from her bed and with a half-seductive, half-sardonic expression walks over to his bed, saying that she has some meat for him. To his horror she hands him a slab of raw meat which is grabbed from his hands by the leader of the gang before he can touch it.

Although the class had no training in the interpretation of dreams, they had read Fromm's "Escape from Freedom" and Freud's "Civilization and Its Discontents" and I had lectured on unconscious processes and symbolic language. I asked the group if anyone felt like trying to interpret the dream. The first attempt was made by Fred, a bright and sophisticated boy from one of the better private schools in New York City. His interpretation was that the boy in the film was still fixated on the oral cannibalistic stage of development, as described by Freud, and therefore wanted raw meat. The interpretation might have been made by a graduate student in clinical psychology or by a first year psychiatric resident, a seemingly logical, but mechanistic and abstract interpreaation which ignored the character of the dreamer as it had been developed within the film. I did not comment, but asked whether there were any other interpretations. Theo raised his hand hesitantly. He ignored Fred's commentary and began to describe accurately the symbolism of the dream. The boy is experiencing what his mother is really like. She cannot even give him cooked meat; the meat she gives him is raw food that he cannot eat. She lacks the warmth to cook the meat, but the boy cannot receive even this primitive nourishment, for it will be grabbed away from him. He lives in a jungle.

Theo's interpretation was much closer to what would be given by an experienced psychoanalyst than Fred's, yet Fred's would more likely meet approval in the typical undergraduate or even graduate psychology course, since right or wrong, it would show that Fred had absorbed some Freudian ideas, while Theo's interpretation might be considered unscientific or too poetic. Yet, it was easier for Theo to develop a serious interest in deepening his psychological understanding than it was for Fred. Theo was interested and his interest was related to real life. He lacked training in systematically investigating a problem, and he had not yet learned to combine information from different sources. He needed to be educated in theoretical understanding and in facts, and he needed someone to tell him that his insights and emotional responses were true. Only if his interest and insights were taken seriously and developed by a teacher, would Theo be able to take the teacher seriously and feel any value in learning from him. Otherwise, the social sciences would remain a game that Theo played badly and intellectual work would be a task to be done as painlessly as possible. But when Theo discovered that his experience was relevant and his perceptions were not only accurate but also profound, he blossomed as a student. At the end of the course, when I asked a number of students whether the course had stimulated them to want to study a problem in greater depth, even if such investigation had nothing to do with any formal coursework, most of the students who answered affirmatively defined the problem in terms of one or another branch of the social sciences. One student wanted to study how the poor could have more political power. Another wanted to study the psychology of political leaders, whether their decisions were determined by rational or irrational motives. Theo, in his answer, grasped more exactly the aim of the course. He was concerned with the meaning of riots in the ghettoes. He felt they were related to the dying off of gangs and in some way were a substitute for gang warfare, but he felt he did not know what caused riots, and he would need to understand a great deal about the political and economic as well as the social and psychological causes.

But the majority of the students like Fred were more alienated both from their own perceptions and emotions, and from the subject matter of the course. It was easier to stimulate and direct students like Theo who had no illusions about the extent of their knowledge than to confront those students who thought they knew a great deal, but who in reality had been stuffed with cliches and were less interested in learning than in impressing their professors, or at the least in giving the professors what they seemed to want. When such students began to discover that the teachers were impressed only by their lack of real interest and not by well-meaning but superdicial generalizations or by a regurgitation of lectures and reading, they felt angry and deceived. Up until this point their teachers had led them to believe that it did not matter whether or not they were interested as long as they complied. Indeed, they considered it unjust for anyone to question their motives or to call their opinions glib. They has as much right to an opinion as anyone, and if they did not really care whether their opinion was true or false, based on experience or hearsay, that was their business.

But a main object of the course was to confront the student with his alienation, not merely alienation from society and from responsibility as a citizen, but alienation from his own experience. The goal was educational rather than therapeutic, to make the student aware of how many of his statements were intellectualized and rootless, for unless the student is concerned with knowing the truth and aware of his own glibness and pre-judgments, it is impossible for him to learn anything worth knowing, and the educational process becomes a dull game, interesting only to the grade hungry and the students who, for one reason or another, wish to imitate their professors.

The goal of confronting the student with his intellectual alienation might be called the psychoanalytic dimension of the course, even though there was no implication that the students were mentally ill. But as in psychoanalysis, the aim was greater awareness, and the uncovering process was painful and difficult. Often it triggered anger and hostility from the student who felt he was being exposed as a fraud or being put down by superior professiorial gamesmanship. More deeply, students began to feel the fear and anxiety that nothing was certain, that all they had learned in the past had to be re-examined and might turn out to be illusion, brain washing from parents, teachers and the mass media. At the same time that they confronted their alienation, it was necessary to show them the possibility of finding out answers for themselves, of trusting in their own experience, of accepting the fact that scientific investigation demands hard work, dedication, and honesty.

I think it is useful to examine the specific forms of resistance we encountered in the students, since if the course or one like it is repeated, the same resistances are bound to occur. First, some students felt hurt that they were being judged unfairly. They felt that they were being accused of being glib and uncaring of people, that if this were so, they were no good and worthless. This resistance reflects the students own harsh moral judgments about people, and it expresses a computer-like form of thinking that substitutes binary judgments for reason and understanding. Nothing in the students' training had prepared them to reason either dialectically or paradoxically. Judgments had to be all or none. For them, confronting superficiality or dishonesty was not the opportunity to develop but rather an irrevocable sentence of failure.

The second resistance focused on the accusation by students that we were trying to indoctrinate them. This resistance served two purposes. The first was to avoid seeing how much their opinions and attitudes toward the poor and towards Negroes were based on previous indoctrination, how much they repeated what they had been told without the awareness that these judgments were not supported by their own experience. An illustration was a section discussion on "Gideon's Trumpet," where we were discussing Gideon's character, his independence and rebelliousness, which had many positive as well as anti-social qualities. The conversation led to the question of whether an independent man could be successful in the corporate society. Many of the students had doubts and reflected that even in their schooling, the pressures to conform were hard to overcome. One boy objected, saying that his father was business executive who had firmly told him that he did not like yes-men and that this showed that independent men are likely to be more successful than conformists. The boy was unaware that he was trying to avoid thinking for himself by opposing his father and his professors, and when he became conscious of this, his first response was anger and sullen withdrawal.

The second function of accusing the professors of trying to indoctrinate was that the students could then avoid doing the work. Instead, they could maintain that one opinion or ideology was no better than any other. They could point to the obvious fact that the professors expressed political positions that were liberal or democratic socialist and maintain that the purpose of the course was to make them think in the same way. In fact, we were explicitly not presenting solutions or political panaceas, but rather analyzing a problem and showing that moral choices are demanded. It was necessary to make it clear to the students that they could be liberals, conservatives, socialists, or reactionaries, but we demanded analysis and knowledge. Concern over a political position in fact proved to be a smokescreen for a lack of interest in learning, a lack of seriousness about investigating the causes of poverty. Fortunately, by dealing directly with this resistance, it dissolved. At the end of the course, one critical student handed out a private questionnaire to his companions, asking them if they felt the professors were trying to indoctrinate the students. Over 90%

answered no. Indeed, some of the better students went on to study seriously without changing their political ideas. An example was Don who at the end of the course commented that he had come to see, at the cost of great resistance, the evils of our economic system, of the profit motive as the basis for running a society, but he still felt that no other system was better and that the best we can do is to try and make the system more humane and try to bring the poor within the system.

Yet, some of the students were frightened by their confrontation with themselves and their society. To think critically, to consider the idea that everything in America is not for the best was a challenge that unnerved them. I think of Mark, a very sensitive and intelligent boy, all to satisfied with his verbal facileness and his easy academic success whose first shock was to see that the Negro students did not believe in his self-image of liberal altruism and in fact found him prejudiced and condescending. Mark could begin to confront his prejudice but he was terrified by his own tendencies to criticise the economic system. At one of the weekly faculty-student lunches, he stated that he had been bothered by a dream the night before. In the dream, he was working in a super market, but he began to criticise the proprietor who immediately told him he was fired. Mark protested that he was a good worker, that there was no cause to throw him out, but to no avail. He found himself out in the cold. He put on a heavy coat, but he was still freezing. He looked for his father to help him, but his father was powerless. A dog bites him and he wakes up frightened.

I asked Pat whether she would interpret the dream, but she first refused, saying she couldn't interpret dreams. "Come on," I insisted, "What is the supermarket?" "That," she said, "is the society Mark lives in. We Negroes don't live in the supermarket, but he does. And if he criticises the people who run it, he is frightened that he will be left out in the cold."

Mark felt a shock of understanding. It became clear to him that he was also beginning to see his father in a new light, less powerful and unable to help him if he were to oppose real power. The dog in the dream reflected the dog at the end of the movie "Los Olvidados", a symbol of aloneness, poverty, and death.

What then were the results of the course? For some students it was a growing awareness of their society and a new interest in understanding. Some of the students were eager to go on and learn the methods of the social sciences, while others felt that other courses in the social sciences would be too mechanical and alienated and they would be better off studying history or the humanities. For many of the disadvantaged students, the course gave them a new confidence in their own abilities and awakened their desire to learn. But for some of the students, the course was threatening, and it was not possible for them to overcome the feeling of having been attacked. Like the students of Morris Raphael Cohen, the philosopher who taught at CCNY, they might have complained: "Professor, you have destroyed our illusions, but what have you put in their place." Professor Cohen, according to the story, replied, "And what did Hercules put in its place when he cleaned out the Aegean stables?"

Yet, there would be no question to anyone reading the students' before and after responses to the question of "Why Are There Poor People in a Rich Society Like the United States?" or in reading the individual research papers that most of the students had learned something about how to analyze a social problem, and had become aware of how much their old opinions reflected neither convictions nor knowledge.

To close, I should like to suggest how the course might be improved in the future.

1. The weakest part of the course was the sections, and the difficulty

was the lack of training of the teaching assistants, as well as their often unconscious rebellion and hostility toward the professors. I think this is to be expected from most graduate students who are in a difficult position with a great wish to be independent of their professors and to give a course of their own. But the result was that lectures often were not discussed in sections, and with exceptions their impact was diluted.

Furthermore, it was difficult for a teaching assistant with training in one discipline to talk about the other disciplines without the fear of making a fool of himself. In the future, it would be wise to give a graduate seminar before the course on the same question and recruit teaching assistants from the seminar. This would work at large universities. At small colleges, high school social studies teachers might be well employed to the mutual benefit of high schools and colleges.

2. The course needed more time, especially to digest so much reading. The six week course had the advantage that it took up all of the students' time. It was intensive, a total experience. But it was not possible for the students to read all of the material, especially toward the end of the course when they began working on their own individual papers.

In the future, the course should either last a year, or if is a summer course, readings must be chosen more caredully.

3. Finally, a criticism can be made that while the most gifted students were able to both confront their alienated knowledge and begin to learn theory and methods, the average student learned very little about the theory and methods of the social sciences. There just wasn't enough time. Yet, in defense, it seems to me that those students who go on to more specialized training within the social sciences will have learned to critically examine theories and methods. They will be alert to the implicit ideological assumptions often hidden beneath scientific rhetoric. They will appreciate the

difference between a desire to understand and a wish to conform to the professor. They will know the difference between trivial and important problems, and many of them will have learned that it is possible for the social sciences to help man to understand the crucial questions with which history confronts him, as long as he does not flee from his own deepest insights and experiences but rather deepens them and tests them systematically and honestly.

In conclusion, the course was rewarding for many of the students and certainly for the professors. The fact that the four professors were extremely compatible and open to continual dialogue was a necessary element in the success of the program.

September 1966

COURSE EVALUATION
for
U. S. OFFICE of EDUCATION PROJECT 6-2132-20

"Development of a New Approach to Teaching Introductory Social Science in College," Sister Marie Augusta Neal, S.N.D.

The reason for doing the experiment:

During the school year 1966-67, a number of social scientists met at Tufts, MIT, Rutgers, and again at MIT, to discuss the problems of inadequacy in current undergraduate social science teaching. Some of the reasons for concern with this issue included:

(1) The current unrest of college students dissatisfied with the style of the learning experience.

(2) The increased interest of college-age students in problems of inadequate social structures such as inner city ghettoes, underdeveloped nations, the arms race, current distribution of goods and services, modes of functioning of city, state, and national systems.

(3) The realization that formal academic training does not give a rich enough grasp of the operation of these structures to allow for effective initiation of alternate programs.

(4) The narrowness of some social science research as well as its irrelevancy.

(5) The isolation from reality of some theorists.

(6) The overeagerness of students to get involved without any adequate understanding of social process.

(7) The low level of academic excellence in the social sciences.

(8) The calibre of student attracted to the social science.

These reasons for experimenting with new forms of teaching become compelling when one considers the demand of a rapidly changing world for not only adequate but superbly trained social scientists to explain current conditions and be consultants for planned programs for changes in current social structures. The reasons for the experiment determined the form of the experimental design. We were primarily interested in (1) student involvement with a genuine scholarly concern (2) the relationship among the social sciences as effective tools of analysis, and (3) communication among social scientists and they with their students as these relationships affect the academic experience of students. The following elements were introduced because they relate to these three interests.

I. We were trying to develop a course that could introduce large, even very large, groups of college freshmen to the social sciences in a way that would stimulate them to a realization of the actual structure of society in some of its complex dimensions, while at the same time the students come to understand somewhat the special approaches of economics, political science, sociology, and psychology to the analysis of this sturcture, wherein this understanding would capture the dynamic dimensions of social processes rather than merely static models. From the beginning of our planning it was hypothesized that the focusing of the course on a relevant social issue which, because of its urgency, necessitated constant policy decisions despite the non-availability of adequate answers, would allow for the development of genuine interest in the problem as well as the opportunity of introducing the complex ideas of the four disciplines in a meaningful and relevant way. For this reason the course focused on the analysis of the following problem: Why do poor people exist in a rich society like the United States? This problem was chosen from a list of ten generated at the original meeting at Tufts. The others dealing with population, freedom, social movements, ideologies, underdevelopment, etc., though interesting, did not in their formulations suggest the possibilities of such a variety of complexities being handled in the one course context. (At this point we feel that any one of these and others could effectively be used to the same end.) Relevant readings on poverty in America, films, and a paper chosen separately by each student as his interest in some aspect of the broader issue was aroused by the lectures or reading were intended to foster personal involvement with the issue of the course as it related to the four disciplines involved.

2. Concurrent presentation of materials from the frames of reference of the four disciplines of economics, sociology, political science, and psychology were used to demonstrate the specific relevancy of these disciplines for the analysis of a complex social issue as well as to test a new manner of handling the introduction to any one of these fields. In this respect the course was intended as a substitute for the principles course, not as an addition to it. The expectation here is that a student who has completed this course would be able to move to an advanced course in the discipline of his choice and that the exposures to principles though limited in this course is adequately substituted for by a clearer understanding of social process, the place of the discipline in relation to the related sciences, and the interest fostered by exposure to the analysis of a genuine issue in this cross disciplinary context.

3. To effect this complex end, the lectures rather than being preplanned and prepared were determined as to order of presentation and specific content through weekly meetings of the four senior teachers assessing what had already been done and determining what emphasis and order whould follow. Thus in the months preceding the giving of the course there were several exchanges of what each member felt constituted for him the most parsimonious set of relevant analyses, descriptions, facts, etc., that he must have lecture time to present in order to give an adequate approach to the problem and to the content of his discipline around this problem. This list was gradually refined but the agreement held that shift of place and content could be made as the course proceeded and the student, graduate student, and senior teachers relationships developed. I think the four teachers involved: Douglas Dowd, economist from Cornell, John Rensenbrink, political scientist from Bowdoin, Michael Maccoby, social psychologist and psychiatrist now at Santa Cruz, and myself as sociologist, would today agree that the challenge of this openness, and the weekly meetings at which we bargained for time, and argued for the legitimacy of certain sequences and then prepared the content was for us one of the most creative dimensions of the course. The follow-up study of the 54 students during the next four years of their college career is the only adequate test of whether this entirely new mode of interrelating the disciplines is, as we would claim now, an effective manner of clarifying and differentiating the disciplines as to mode of analysis, methods, use of theory, and relevancy to the other disciplines. The assigned readings again made this point in that they brought to the student a variety of approaches but all in ways immediately related to the issue and to the lectures.

Readings were assigned by the week and always with reference to the related lectures. Once a week each student met with a small group of seven or eight students and one teacher to discuss these readings in detail.

There were other aspects of the course which had their own elements of interest and limitations, such as the mixture of students including Negro and white, middle class and poor, differences in religious commitment, and differences in college of destination: Cornell and Emmanuel. All had a marked effect on the interaction patterns. These I shall not dwell on here even though they were of great interest and impact, since they were not built into the original design with any expectation of specific outcome. The living together arrangements, the informal contacts at lunch and through social; all were effective in the course but not peculiar to this course.

EVALUATION OF THE EXPERIMENT

The only control element that the observer can examine to determine the effects of this course are the before-after essays which each student submitted. These are included in the Appendix. What they reveal quite clearly is that most students, perhaps all but two, answered the question of the course naively and to a great extent irresponsibly at the outset. There was a high level of unawareness of the problem posed and a concomitant willingness to dismiss it despite the fact that it was proposed with seriousness. The after-essays are not so easy to evaluate. They are not brilliant. But they do show a difference in awareness of the existence of the problem, the causes, related concerns, and a reluctance to be definitive, minus the earlier tendency to dismiss the problem as unimportant. The individual term papers of students range in competence as do those in most classes from very fine to very poor and a number of them lack imagination. The real differences that are available for examination are in the attitudes of the faculty and the students toward their chosen disciplines and toward the other social sciences. Most of those who shared this experience felt that something important happened to them in their understanding of the social sciences and their openness to use them seriously in the future.

The major limitation of the experience was the difficulty that developed and persisted in incorporating the graduate students into the open and easy dialogue on the problem of the course in the discussion sections which were daily under their control for a full hour long period. It was originally intended that these periods which regularly followed the hour and a half of lecture and discussion with a half hour interim for relaxation would be tightly linked to the lecture of the day and focus on student-raised questions arising out of the earlier sessions. That in fact this did not happen during the first four weeks of the course to any significant degree can be explained by a number of factors: (1) the lack of early preparation of these very fine students in the readings from the other disciplines (2) limited exposure to the experimental design prior to class performance in which they were expected to play a highly visible and central role (3) the traditional style of graduate student section-leader role-expectation. This problem in the post course evaluation suggested the need of a pro-seminar in the semester prior to the giving of such a course for those graduate students who will be involved in the teaching program. There was general consensus that this was a good idea and a necessary step. It may also be true that social scientists who attempt an experiment of this nature need to possess some genuine interest in the related fields since the very purpose of this course suggests that biases against other disciplines can build up resistances to perceiving their relevancy beyond a certain supportive role to the discipline one chooses as "queen."

In another attempt I would work further on the most relevant readings. I do not think we have found all of these yet and they are centrally important to the course. In this course Harrington's The Other America, Erich Fromm's Escape From Freedom, Miller's Rich Man, Poor Man, Dowd's Modern Economic Problems in Historical Perspective, and the Bobbs Merrill reprints in sociology were quite effective. I do not think we have yet found the best political science readings and I think they will probably be short selections like the sociology readings when worked out effectively, though one really good book demonstrating how some aspect of the political system operates in response to stimulation from this issue would be invaluable, as would also be something on the changing class structure.

In summary it seems to me that the most effective aspects of the course include the analytic insights made possible by focus on a relevant social issue in a cross discipline presentation and the change in the structure of student-teacher relations in the open dialogue across disciplines in response to a completed presentation.

THE CORNELL EXPERIMENT IN SOCIAL SCIENCE SUMMER 1966

by John Rensenbrink

This essay is my interpretation of the experimental social science course at Cornell University in which I participated this past summer. I wish to give an idea of its character; assess the relevance of the course to social science teaching; and draw certain conclusions concerning the nature of the social sciences.

Form and Matter

Four professors whose training and experience were in the fields of economics, psychology, sociology and political science [1] taught together--primarily through lectures--a group of 65 pre-freshmen students in a six week program on the thematic question "Why are there Poor People in a Rich Society like the United States?"

We were joined by three teaching assistants, [2] one each in political science, psychology and economics, who conducted regular discussion sections following the lectures; and by a film expert [3] who showed nine films and led discussions based on these films. [4]

---

[1] Names of Professors

[2] Names of teaching assistants

[3] Name of film expert. He also had responsibility for making an overall evaluation of the course.

[4] Examples of films seen were Sixteen in Webster Grove, Harvest of Shame, Proposition 14, The Cool World, The Young and the Damned, The Corner.

The entire faculty attended each lecture. There were four lectures each week, each lecture period lasting one and a half hours divided into a lecture proper and a short discussion session in which faculty and students were expected to participate freely.

Each Wednesday the class was divided into seven special discussion groups in which particular books used in the course were to be subjected to closer analysis [5] and in which other matters were to be discussed such as the writing of the course paper. The sixth "Wednesday session" was held on Friday, the last day of the course, and featured a panel of six students responding to questions concerning the course raised by the rest of the class.

The professors sat in on the discussion sections, at first on a regular basis, but after a few weeks on the basis of ad hoc arrangements between the section leader and the professor. This was done in order to give the teaching assistant greater sense of autonomy in the classroom.

The students wrote an essay at the first session on the question of the course and again at the last session. Each student also wrote a twelve to fifteen page course paper. There were no examinations. Grades were either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. All students got an S in the course except one whose work was judged incomplete.

---

[5] The books discussed at the Wednesday sessions were Harrington's Other America, Fromm's Escape from Freedom, Hollingshead's Elmtown's Youth, Miller's Rich Man, Poor Man, and Anthony Lewis's Gideon's Trumpet. A complete list of the books used in the course is given in Appendix A.

The boys lived together in one dorm, the girls in another. They all ate their meals together with the exception of breakfast. Faculty members joined the students for lunch on Monday and several had lunch with the students at other times during the week.

Most of the students were from middle class homes, either white collar or small business and professional. Some, however, were upper middle class, and some blue collar. About a dozen members of the class were Negroes from the ghettoes of New York, Cleveland, Washington, D.C. This diversity, especially the contrast in outlook and experience between the blacks and the whites, was a major factor in the course.

Consider the following random examples of things talked about in the course: the kind of discrimination in housing and jobs which claims the right of personal choice or of private property or both; awareness of class and recognition of class stereotypes; the meaning of black power; the difference in perception deriving from different life experience and styles of life; the nature of social anomie; the economic basis of the erosion of the father's position in the families of the poor; the gap between liberal legislation and enforcement of legislation, and correlatively, between the rhetoric and the record of anti-poverty programs; the middle class character of contemporary American education; the limitations of the welfare and ameliorative approaches to the stubborn realities of poverty and racial oppression;

the relationship between economic and political impotence, and conversely of economic and political power; the quality as well as the extent of the disparity between rich and poor in American society; the distinction between destructive rebellion and a revolutionary spirit; the degree to which American belief in personal success results in a radical emphasis on individual upward mobility at the expense of a social understanding of man and of a public interest in social renewal--these are examples of themes and problems, raised in the lectures and the discussions, which gained greater force because of the lively presence of a group of Negroes with personal experience of ghetto life. By their presence and because of their presence they helped to stimulate a frankness and seriousness of intellectual encounter among students and staff which by the standards of the normal college course was extraordinary.

The origins and preliminary development of the course go back to discussions held at the Tufts seminar on Innovations in Undergraduate Instruction in September 1965; to the teaching of a course on poverty by "our sociologist," Sister Marie Augusta Neal, at Emmanuel College in the autumn semester 1965; and to the further discussions and plans for action worked out at the Rutgers seminar on Social Science teaching in January 1966.

However, actual planning of the course itself did not take place until the weekend preceeding the start of classes. There were two planning sessions during this weekend. Instead of trying to draw up a careful blueprint of action we established certain guidelines, for example: (a) the approach each of us would take to our respective subjects; (b) the order in which we felt the parts of our subject should be introduced; and (c) the timing of our lectures so that as much as possible the four of us would provide multiple disciplinary perspectives on the same social question at the same time.

These initial planning sessions (and there were to be several more, held on Monday of each week) gave the four of us a rough but ready guide to what we were going to do. The same could not be said for the teaching assistants. Their first contact with the course was at the initial weekend planning sessions. Under the circumstances they did not and could not have been expected to get a very clear sense of what was going to happen when. They were very much like passengers taking a tour through a strange city in a car not their own and which they were not driving and would not be expected to drive; they could note street names and landmarks and maybe get a sense of certain parts of the town, but the overall layout,or continuity of streets, or the relation of parts one to the other, or the idea of the city, all this might well have to remain opaque to them. This I think continued to be the case, though with gradual improvement and some marked moments of exception.

Once the course got under way, the lectures began to take on a life of their own, though they followed the framework of informal understandings and decisions reached during the initial planning sessions.

Douglas Dowd began with two lectures on the historical development of capitalism and on the transformation of that system in the 20th century. He cited the growth of a capitalist market ideology which blurs the nature of the transformation and blocks changes needed to meet the problems created by that transformation, as for example, the parallel and paradoxical increase in technological capability and in the number of poor people. He established the thesis that the situation of the poor under these conditions is one in which their number very likely will continue to increase even while the system, by its own criteria, sustains a steady growth.

Michael Maccoby followed with two lectures. He distinguished between behavior and the forces which underlie behavior. He subjected judgments based on the observation of behavior (as for example the notion that the poor are poor because they are lazy) to an analysis of the different ways character is formed in response to different economic and ideological forces. He developed the concepts of the unconscious and of repression. He emphasized how learning is decisively affected by the processes of repression and that unless an individual achieves awareness of these two processes as they operate in him, the knowledge he acquires about himself, about others and about society will remain separate from the self, that is, alienated--either in the passive sense of knowledge that is "known" but not "felt", or in the active sense of knowledge put in the service of conscious--seemingly rational, but unexamined--impulses, attitudes, and views of the world.

I followed with two lectures, identifying three questions central to the establishment of any political system: that of a unity which is based neither on nature nor on force but on some principle of choice; that of an ordering of the struggle for parity and power among the parts of the union; and that of creating space, or freedom, for individual action and individual opinion. I distinguished political systems according to the way they answered these questions, paying special attention to the idea of a public, or republic. In applying this to the United States, I described certain forces in the present situation such as the increasing militarization of the government, and of definitions of national unity, under the impact of war; the continuing concentration of wealth or control over productive forces and a growing imbalance in the struggle for parity and power among the interests of society; the subtle transformation of opinion into ideology to make these economic and military facts consistent with democratic values; and the overwhelming dependence of individual opinion on a mass media dominated by forces lukewarm or opposed to change. I questioned whether these forces were not bringing the American republic into decline, and cited the growth in the number of the poor in the face of abundance and the intensification of the racial struggle as two important symptoms of that decline.

Sister Marie Augusta Neal, in her first lecture, defined the kinds of things sociologists look at-- and how they look at them: for example, that institutions are sets of rules for getting things done, that the authority of a group derives from the fact that members share a certain definition of the situation in which the group finds itself; that an analysis of a social system must include attention both to social structure and social change and that unless you can modify people's definition of their situation, change will not take place. Therefore the problem of poverty in a society of abundance stems not from technical difficulties of distribution or communication or faulty productive capacity bit it stems from sets of rules in various institutions which cause people to distribute goods and services in a particular way and according to a particular set of criteria. Since these rules (of economic, political, and educational rationality) are imbedded in the way Americans define their situation, and appear besides to accord with the wider values of freedom and equality of opportunity honored by their culture, it follows (a) that the poor themselves tend to define the situation in accordance with the prevailing culture, (b) that the poor are regarded by the majority of Americans--and often by themselves as unfortunates or as failures, as deserving of their fate, or at best as objects of charity, and (c) that the only possibility for real change towards a solution of the problem can come about through a change in the definition of the situation.

Accompanying these lectures were film showings of Football, a documentary account of the pressures and psychological intensities manifested in coaches, players, teaches and townspeople as two traditional high school rivals get set for their annual autumn clash; *The Corner*, a study of street life in Chicago; and *Harvest of Shame*, an insight into the life of migrant workers. The discussions were led by Gene Lichtenstein so as to include an analysis both of the style of a film and how it was put together as well as of its subject matter.

This ended the introductory phase of the course and already two weeks had gone by. In the third, fourth and fifth weeks the lectures elaborated on themes and concepts already introduced, brough in new ones to fill out the analysis, and made a variety of applications to the problem of poverty, showing how the reasons for it engage the inquirer in a highly inter-related complex of social, psychological, cultural, economic, and political factors which in turn all together require a critical assessment of American society as a whole.

Sister Marie Augusta, Douglas Dowd and myself gave a set of three lectures in the third week on social interaction, class and class structure, income distribution, the relative representation of interests in the government and the character and politics of Congress.

Sister Marie and Michael Maccoby followed with four lectures on socialization, selective preception (its influence, for example, on voting behavior), middle class definitions of achievement, the formation of character in accord with the norms of achievement, the limitations of education, the relation of men and women and the role of the family in distorting personality under pressures of economic distress and alienation;

and the social-psychological foundations of attitudes towards law and authority. I then lectured on the nature and system of authority in the American republic and on the latter day actions of the Supreme Court in constitutional law, criminal law, and definitions of freedom.

In the fifth week Douglas Dowd lectured twice on the major forces working in the American economy, giving both a micro-economic and a macro-economic analysis. He described the aims of government intervention in the economy as the attempt to keep a market system viable in spite of its tendency to monopoly, and as the further attempt to enable that system, via the use of monetary and fiscal controls, to achieve high productive levels in spite of a tendency to stagnation. These aims, he argued, and the means used to accomplish them, do not necessarily support a public interest in social health and cultural vitality or the particular economic interest of the poor. In fact, the self-regarding habits of mind and the standards of success required by the prevailing economic systems virtually preclude the development from within itself to institutions or programs of action which can meet these interests. That is, the needs of poor people and the needs of many who though not poor are marginally within the system, as well as the wider needs of the public, are met only inso far as efforts are made which run counter to the logic of the system.

Sister Marie followed with a lecture on alienation and anomie. She went on to discuss the problems of the person who seeks to move from the ghetto or ghetto-like quality of life in a particular group to the wider society. She ended by distinguishing five types of responses people make to the goals and norms of a particular system.

On the next day I lectured on the Presidency, asking whether good people in politics make an important difference and whether or not the Presidency is an agent of change. I concluded that both questions should be answered negatively. The reasons are imbedded in the powerful economic and international political forces operating upon the Presidency to restrict his leeway for action; they are further to be derived from the nature of a media dominated public opinion and veto group politics, both of which factors invite manipulation of behavior rather than engagement withunderlying forces. Conversely, no agency or power exists to help the man in the office once he gets there to pursue intergrative public policies.

During this period of three weeks we saw four films: Proposition 14, which focused closely on political activity for and against the anti-open housing referendum in California in 1964; Sixteen in Webster Grove, a documentary on middle class teen-agers in a St. Louis suburb; Salt of the Earth, a movie about labor movement activity in the early fifties among Mexican Americans in the Southwest; and The Young and the Damned, a stunning film on gangs and slum life in Mexico City. The discussions arising from these films were really good, not only lively and sharp and,sometimes intense, but often profound as well.

During thr finsl week we lectured on the problems and prospects of action leading to social change Douglas Dowd discussed policies. He concluded however that the real problem is not that of finding policies but of organizing power to put policies into effect. The chances of this happening are doubtful considering the fact that the present crisis, by contrast to the events leading to the New Deal, is not felt immediately by those having power and position as being an economic one affecting them, but only as a "moral" one.

I lectured on political parties and contrasted the contemporary liberal and intellectual mood of modest meliorative optimism with the radical response of American parties and social movements in the past to questions facing American society. This mood seems somewhat incongruous in the face of the complex and massive problems which history has chosen to thrust into the lap of American society at this particular moment: poverty and alienation at home, even greater poverty and alienation abroad, the pall mall pace of technology in production, distribution, communication and war, the blight of cities, and the related blight of racial repression. These problems, I held, were going to be met by society in one way or another, and that the temptation of meeting them in a mood of reactive fear or revolutionary anger seems to be getting harder to resist. What is required is a mood of radical courage and a movement towards new sub-structures of power, new structures of communication, new or renewed institutions of learning and new kinds of leaders.

Michael Maccoby stressed the necrophilic tendency of modern life seen in the growing mechanization of institutions and the character structure of modern industrial man. This mechanization seems to have achieved a momentum which drives society to treat human beings and human qualities more and more as if they were only objects and processes. The possibility seems slight that industrial society will or can initiate change in sufficient depth to reverse the dynamic. First steps require an awareness of self and society and the overcoming of fear which this awareness brings.

In the final lecture Sister Marie Augusta discussed the nature of social change, the movement of history from one style of life, one set of values, norms, role behavior and role expectations to others; how the various steps in the process of change may be charted; how these steps follow one another either in a gradual, incorporative manner or in a more abrupt, revolutionary fashion. She raised the question of the relation of planning to social change, whether planned change is possible now, and ended with the thought that a new element has entered the historical process in the twentieth century--the development of the social sciences--and that this can and may become a force for creative change.

Character of the Course

The preceding account of the form and matter of the course should demonstrate that a judgment of its quality and worth is by no means a straightforward affair. This should be apparent whether the judgment is negative or positive. Very much depends on how, or by what standards, one measures quality and worth.

For exqmple, suppose one were to observe that the course doesn't seem to provide adequate foundation in any of the disciplines represented. This might be a fair statement, a plausible objection, if we were agreed that the aim of innovation in college freshman education is a better, more efficient framework in which to accomplish what presently is done separately, and less efficiently, in the introductory courses.

Again, suppose one were to point out that the course didn't seem to come up with many new ideas about learning and relied heavily on such traditional means as lectures and discussion sections. This also might be a fair statement and a plausible objection, if what you are looking for first of all, as an answer to the educational problem, are more imaginative, interesting, and dynamic methods of teaching and tools of learning.

Finally, suppose one were to say that for a problem-centered course there seemed a surprising lack of attention to practical issues of policy or to particular solutions to problems, or to conflicting views which circulate around alternative solutions. This is a fair statement. It is a plausible objection only if we are agreed that what is needed in college education are social science courses which immerse the student in social problems and which give him the skill in logic and investigative techniques that make him competent to spot issues and either think them out or deal with them, or both, in a manner appropriate to an intelligent voter.

There are other objections, as for example, that the course sounds very "moral", a complaint I will refer to later, but the examples given are important objections. Our answer may be put as follows, I am speaking for myself though I believe that I am also speaking with my colleagues.

However much we may honor and support efficiency, exposure to discipline, creative techniques, and sensitivity to public issues, nevertheless we regard them as subsidiary to the real question. We believe that as subsidiary values they only become truly alive once the real question is faced successfully; and conversely that such values act as convenient crutches for the innovator to lean upon in the absence of an encounter with the real question.

That question has two sides: A. When does knowledge become knowledge in the minds of those who study social things? and B. What is the stance of the social scientist--and of his science--over against the social system of which he and his science are a part?

The answers we gave to these two related questions and which we articulated through our discussions with one another and with students and in our lectures were: A. That real knowledge of social things can only grow in the mind of a person once he is prodded into, or stumbles upon, or (less likely) moves gradually towards awareness: awareness of self (the ambiguities of feeling, the contradictoriness of received opinions), awareness of his way of seeing social reality as a particular way, awareness of his freedom, and of the problematic nature of his choices with respect to that freedom; and B. That the appropriate intellectual stance of the social scientist is a critical stance which in the first instance is an impulse to examine severely the processes, structures and assumptions of his society, and in the second instance is an impulse to move steadily towards greater theoretical understanding of what society in all of its ramifications really is and can be, and greater analytic precision as to how it may be expected to decline or develop in response to different forces and conditions.

I think all of us who taught the course would recognize that the answers we gave to the real question (awareness and a critical stance) need not necessarily be the answers given by any social scientist. But we would also wish to point out that other answers--as for example one which emphasizes a greater empirical immediacy as over against our more severe analytical distance, and one which correlatively embodies a greater inclination towards an accommodating as distinct from a critical stance--can only be articulated in a scientific spirit if the answers presuppose a coming to terms with the question, and do not in fact suppress or ignore the question.

In social science the full intellectual self-consciousness and hence integrity of the inquirer and teacher is crucial. We feel that a great deal of contemporary social science is too closely tied to the things it is investigating, too deeply embedded in the stuff of the system about which it is fashioning explanatory concepts and models, for it to extricate itself sufficiently from the outlooks and conventional wisdom of the people who rule and the ideas which dominate the system. Furthermore, it is only with this argument firmly in mind that one could take up the question of the relative amounts of morality or moralism in various approaches to the pursuit and the teaching of the social sciences. I think a discourse on the question would reveal that the approach we have taken in the Cornell experiment, because it is critical and stresses awareness as the touchstones of knowledge, is much less vulnerable to moralism than most standard social science courses. Because they are not critical these standard courses have the effect of reinforcing prevailing middle class American moral views and give those views the additional power of enlightened liberal sophistication.

In the course we did not in any literal self conscious way promulgate our answers to the real question. Rather, these answers formed and informed our approach. They defined the atmosphere of intellectual culturewithin which or out of which or because of which we did what we did. They were the guiding impulses of our encounter with each other, our disciplines, and our students. They constituted in their articulated and embodied form the character of our course.

Yet it is unlikely that any of this would have happened, that any of us--teachers or students--would have encountered ourselves and our society and each other's disciplines with quite the same seriousness if we had not been confronted by the problem set for us in the course, why are there poor people in a rich society like the United States.

This problem gave us a common focus in historical reality from which we all could take our points of departure and to which we could, and were indeed forced, to return. Instead of being faced with the task of splicing our disciplines together (as might have been the case for example had we given a course on some such theme as man and society in a time of change) we didn't worry about splicing or integrating or inter-relating, but concentrated on how well we could treat the problem of poverty and how what the other disciplines said on the subject affected or might modify our treatment of it. In other words, we had what might be called an "objective correllative", the many faces of poverty, by means of which we could look into, reach into, one another's disciplines, get to understand better, to borrow, perhaps to blend with one's own, but all without dissolving the autonomy of our own discipline. This is important I think: the study of a problem of this kind permits a movement towards greater unity in the social sciences without destroying the accomplishments already won in the various disciplines.

Another major advantage to the study of a problem is that it offers up to the eyes of the social scientist not first of all disconnected facts or states of being, but a live historical reality which is in a state of movement from one thing to something else. This, I believe, keeps the social scientist epistemologically "honest" or relevant: he must be aware of a context within which the things are, which are to be studied; he must be sensitive to the distinction between what is apparent and what is real in the disposition of actual forces present in the contact; he is led to see the need for a theoretical understanding of change; and he must be alert to the nature of human purposes.

Of course, just not any problem will do. For example, problems in other societies or in other historical periods (those which do not incorporate a sense of the shape and significance of a similar problem in one's own society) lend themselves to an "objective" treatment and to the danger of acquiring knowledge that is alien and of making judgments of other societies which are dogmatic and culturally bound.

Another example of a problem that doesn't fit the requirements is the simulated problem. However well contrived or planned in its nuances and inner juxtapositions, or however much it captures the quality of life in one's own society, such a problem lacks genuine facticity and hence cannot be taken altogether seriously in a scientific sense by students or teacher. It also lacks existential fidelity, an inner correspondence to real life, and hence lacks the power of developing that moral understanding essential to social science inquiry. Stimulated problems are necessarily rational in their contrivance even when they seek to embody the irrational play of forces; whereas problems embedded in the stuff of ongoing history participate in the contradictions immanent within the process and teach one the complexity of things, the dialectic character of forces and the ambiguity of action.

A third and last example of the wrong kind of problem is one that lacks importance or centrality, even though it is a real problem and has existence in one's own society. A person would be hard put for instance to develop a social science course on the problem of why there are parking meters in the smaller cities of America. Doubtless it could be done by ingenious people, and it might even be quite interesting and revealing; but the problem lacks compelling historical authenticity; meaning thereby:

1) that history confronts society with certain imperious questions upon answers to which depend that society's survival and further development;
2) that these questions will be answered by society in one way or another;
3) that it is always problematic whether society will answer them through more or less blind adjustment and piecemeal repair work, or with the aid of theoretical understanding and discernment of priorities;
4) that it is the task of the social sciences to seek to provide society with the theoretic analysis, critical understanding and the fundamentals of moral discernment; and
5) that therefore social science derives its particular character from the manner and the effectiveness with which it encounters the central questions of the age.

Poor people in a rich society is such a question; as is war in a nuclear world; or work in a technologically progressive society; or the future existence of Western man in a world dominated by non-western peoples. Each of these is rooted in a contradiction or an ambiguity, each poses a problem directly for existence: it is in the encountering of such problems that real thought is born.

The latter paragraphs have wandered from a direct discussion of the Cornell course to talk about the promise of such a course. But how nearly did the Cornell experiment in fact fulfill that promise? More than I think most of us thought likely when we began.

The faculty were deeply engaged. The students on the other hand were by turns shocked, upset, excited, felt deflated, felt expanded, felt confronted--sometimes affronted, began to confront others not excluding their teachers, sometimes withdrew into shells and came out again. In spite of an increasing sense of the complexity of the problem and of the social sciences, and a strong sense of frustration because of the apparent ambiguity of solutions to the problem, the students came out at the end rather more realistic than before and in many instances capable of much more sophisticated analysis and judgment. Many became aware of class for the first time. Many saw themselves in a new light, or in a way they never thought possible or important before. Very few, in fact probably no one,felt it was possible to shrug off what they had met up with as of no account to their lives and careers.

Quite a few students changed their minds about what they wanted to do in college or which social science they wished to follow. There was one young man who in this connection seemed to capture the idea of the course for himself. On the last day's panel discussion, after several students had said they wanted to go in this particular social science or that one, he spoke out to say he wished to get on with a study of the problem of violence.

In some students, not many, a fundamental change took place in the way they saw things and felt about them. Some we did not reach at all.

The short essays the students wrote at the beginning and at the end of the course were indicative of these varied reactions and results. They proved to be good barometers of the accomplishments and limitations of the experiment.

Points of Stress

Among the limitations and difficulties I would cite the following as most important.

1. It proved difficult to generate and sustain interaction between lecture and discussion section. The staff had several meetings about this during the six weeks. In particular instances the sections did exploit the lectures in a positive way, especially during the last two weeks. But on the whole I believe the sections were as much a hindrance as a help. I should add that the sections were competently, and

in one instance dynamically led. But there was much less engagement than there might have been with the systematically articulated matter of the lecture. There was only sporadic effort to understand, criticize, advance or reject the substance of the lecture. The section tended to become a separate element, at best a tributary to the mainstream of the course rather than an integral part thereof.

2.) A second difficulty was the amount of reading we asked and tried to expect the student to do. It was too much in the short time available. Consequently less reading was done than could have been accomplished if we had tried for less and thus been on stronger ground to push the reading. As a matter of fact, not infrequently the student was given large reading assignments two days and sometimes only one day in advance of a lecture for which the reading was supposed to be background. This we recognize is poor pedagogy, especially in the light of our strong belief that readings and lectures must be fully integrated and that therefore readings must have been done by the suudent before the lecture. It was however encouraging to us to note the number of students who in spite of these obstacles apparently managed to do considerable reading.

3.) A related casulty of over-loaded reading assignments was any concerted effort to teach students the art of reading a book with care and systematic concentration. In the Wednesday sessions some of this was accomplished, but with insufficient rigour. Nor is it possible to do rigorous analysis of one book in a single session of one to two hours, especially if it is a good book. Any future course of this kind should have built into it a number of sessions deliberately devoted to explications of texts written by first rate minds. In a six weeks course we did not have time to do this.

4. The lectures were intensive, full, closely argued and hence frequently quite tough on the lecturers. The lectures were often over the heads of, or besides the heads of, the students. The discussion part of the lecture period came to be dominated more and more by the faculty. Yet none of these things had a merely negative impact; they wore a double edge and called into being other forces which often more than compensated for their original roughness. The students seem to have acquired considerable knowledge from the lectures in spite of, or maybe because of, the fact that the lectures were over their heads. Furthermore, students found the faculty exchange at the end of the lecture sometimes dramatic and often useful in clearing up or further developing points lost in the lecture.

However, it may be possible to retain these advantages in the future and nevertheless pitch the lectures, not lower, but more precisely within the reach and range of the student's mind; to proceed in a less intellectually overwhelming manner in a lecture; and to build up direct student participation in the discussion. But for that there must be more time than what was allotted us in a six week program.

Suggestions for the Future

1. The limitation of time was an important factor in most of the difficulties cited above. For that reason we agreed at our review sessions on the weekend following the end of classes that the course if and when offered again should run for a full academic year.
2. Less tractable is the first difficulty cited above. The overcoming of it depends on the familiarity and intellectual commonwealth of faculty and teaching assistants. That commonwealth, we learned from our experience, should already exist at the start of the course. We endorsed the suggestion made by one of us that a pro-seminar on the poverty question should be conducted for prospective teaching assistants during the semester preceeding the course, and that this seminar should be led by professors who will be teaching in the course.
3. It may be valuable to experiment with recruiting teaching assistants from among advanced social studies and history teachers in the high schools.
4. The film program was a highly successful and integral part of the course. The films generated or became the occasion for excellent discussions in which the students participated freely and with growing sophistication as the weeks went by. Any future course should make full use of films. And we

think that plays, novels, and short stories, carefully selected for their relevance to the lectures, should also be introduced. Dramatic and documentary materials, visual or written, are not only useful, we believe, but essential to the teaching of the social sciences. If nothing else they correct for false intellectual abstraction and beyond that they can strongly complement efforts in the other parts of the course to preserve and develop the existential human character of the social sciences.

5. The experiment had the benefit of a small number of students in relation to faculty. We felt at the end that the course might have been equally successful with many more students, though it was a boon to be able to conduct it initially with such manageable numbers. It is possible that the course in the future could handle as many as 300 students or maybe more. This would require the participation of many teaching assistants, a fact which places a high premium on the need for the preparatory seminar suggested above. Full intellectual commonwealth of the participating teachers--a commonwealth which seeks to steer clear equally of mere intellectual conformity and mere pluralism--is I believe fundamental to success in common ventures of teaching and discovery in the social sciences.

John Rensenbrink

Bowdoin College
September, 1966

James Buyoucos

Theories of Delinquency

In this paper, I will attempt to explain the forces in society and those in the ghetto subculture which society has produced, that mold, push and pull certain young male inhabitants of the ghetto into a general class of kids sometimes known as jitterbugs, bebops, young hoodlums, or juvenile delinquents.

There are many forces in our society which mold and force people into submission and escape. Erich Fromm, in his book Escape from Freedom, that when a person goes through the process of individualization and his primary ties with the world are cut, great feelings of isolation, insignificance, aloneness, and powerlessness arise within him. A good example of this is the following excerpt from The Cool World by Warren Miller.

> "You start figurin who I am and why am I here in Harlem - an man they aint no end to it. You end up askin your self whut is the world and what was the world before it was the world. an did GOD make this world. An who made GOD. where he from? Shitman they aint no end to it an you just scared."

To combat these feelings most people try to escape by conforming to the American way of life; striving for status and power; making money surrounding themselves with possessions, seeking entertainment taking pride in America, being king in the home, ruling over people in some socially accepted way, or even by fighting against the system and working for social betterment.

Most of these socially accepted ways of escape are not available to young kids growing up in the ghetto because they are in the lower class. Many of these kids attempt to solve their problems through what is called deviant behavior or juvenile delinquency.

Many social scientists tend to give overgeneralized and unqualified views in trying to explain the causes of delinquency.

In a study of deviant behavior, it is essential to understand and relate both the psychological and sociological factors involved.

I will begin by studying some of the possible effects of the home life in the early development of the delinquent child in the ghetto.

In many studies, it has been found that many juvenile delinquents had severe emotional problems which developed in early childhood. The results of a study by William Healy led him to state, "Hence it comes that in weighing all possible causes for delinquency, we have been tremendously impressed by the prevalence of profoundly felt emotional disturbances among the delinquents". Healy[1] traces many of these disturbances to childhood. IN his study, such delinquency was paired with a control (non-delinquent) from the same family. He found the delinquent had many more symptoms of disturbances. For example, thirty-one delinquents versus thirteen non-delinquents had difficult sphincter training.[1]

In trying to locate the source of these emotional disturbances, it is necessary to have an understanding of the parents' situation and role. The probabilities are that the parents grew up in a home environment somewhat similar to that of their children and thus developed many psychological problems. The psychology of poverty is self perpetuating. When there is added to this the frustration, anxiety and abuse of their daily lives, and the fact that they are probably poor, it is not difficult to understand the extreme difficulty they face in trying to do an adequate job in raising their children.

Everybody needs to feel loved and secure as a child. When these feelings are lacking, the child suffers greatly. Due to his parents' poverty, the child of the ghetto grows up in an environment of constant deprivation. He goes without enough food in many cases. He doesn't have proper clothes. He is much more prey to illness than the middle class child. He is deprived of the toys he wants.

Parentâl relations, in the matriarchal society of the ghetto, are not conducive to normal development. In many cases, the child is exposed to the hostility, too often evidenced by physical conflict, which exists between the parents. In many cases, the child himself becomes the object of his parents' hostility. This may create great anxiety in the child. Due to the absence of a male in many homes, the child is inclined to identify with the mother at a young age and feel insecure about his manhood.

There are many factors, thus, in the home life of the child which rob him of his feelings of security.

Another aspect in which the parents may fail the child is in the way they understand and direct his natural drives or id. Kate Friedlander,[6] in a paper on antisocial behavior, states that as a cause of antisocial behavior "the failure of the ego to develop towards the reality principle is the key to the disturbance. It becomes clear that an early environment that fails to exert a constant pressure on the expression of those instinctual urges which, because they are of an antisocial nature, must eventually be modified, tends to predispose an individual towards this character disturbance." It is virtually impossible for the parents with all their problems to be consistent in their handling of the child. This could be one of the causes of a faulty ego or superego.

Another source of anxiety in the case of a Negro child is his awareness of the race problem as transmitted to him by his parents. Before he fully understands the situation, he is filled with a fear that there is something wrong with him. Thus, the child, before he really enters society, is imbued with many psychological problems. By the time the child reaches the age of 5 or 6, he is usually spending most of his time on the street with other children, many of whom have the same deep seated feelings of anxiety and insecurity.

The streets of the ghetto are usually crowded with people of all ages - young children playing, teenagers and adults hanging around drinking, shooting dice, trying to hustle some money, or just chatting or watching. It is here, on the street, that the child acts out many of his feelings - feeling of insecurity, aggression - and develops so many of his values and attitudes. Delinquency can be directly caused by the child acting on his feelings of insecurity, hostility, etc.

W.B. Miller,[2] a sociologist, theorized that delinquency was a result of young people trying to adhere to the values of the community. He describes what he calls focal concerns "of the community around which behavior and attitudes of the residents are based."

I would like to proceed in following the development of the child by looking at him through Miller's focal concerns.

1. Trouble and Excitement - There are not adequate recreational facilities in most of the ghettos. Most youngsters have no toys. Therefore, when the children, with their feelings of insecurity and deprivation, are playing together, there is a tendency for them to get into some sort of trouble in their search for excitement. As time progresses, many of them become quite adept at avoiding handling trouble as it comes up, and they take trouble for granted.

2. Toughness - The older children push the younger children around, who, in turn, pick children younger than themselves, a continuing process. The child observes that the people who appear to get most respect on the street are usually the toughest. Learning to handle oneslef in a fight is practically a necessity in the ghetto and a high value is placed on it.

3. Smartness - In a culture of scarcity (as the ghetto has been described), being smart is also a necessity. The child must learn how to "hustle" in order to get the things he wants. Each neighborhood usually has a living example of this. The good hustler, con man, or pimp usually drives a Cadillac and wears expensive clothes. It is also necessary to be smart in order to keep from being humiliated. For example, putting others down or playing the dozens is a common passtime in the ghetto. If the child doesn't learn to be fast with his tongue, he will get laughed at.

4. Luck - In many cases, the only way to make it in the ghetto is to be lucky. That is mainly why the numbers rackets flourish in the ghetto. As the child gets older, he may likely develop an attitude that it is good or bad luck which is determining his life and he may be right.

While the child is being socialized in the streets, he usually is coming into conflict with one or both of his parents. In most homes there is somebody who wants the child to be straight. Thus, when the child follows the rules of the ghetto, he may find himself getting whipped when he gets caught "messing up". This produces a feeling of ambivalence in the child and is a further source of anxiety and guilt.

Miller's theory leads one to the conclusion that the child develops a sort of delinquent superego. It must be pointed out that many children live in the ghetto without becoming delinquents. Others behave like delinquents - yet they have a definite feeling of ambivalence. The main factor in the degree of the child's acceptance or rejection of any of the values which are presented to him is the child's psychological makeup.

While being socialized on the street and at home, the child is also at certain times being socialized in middle class terms through such areas as school, mass media, church, and to some extent the home.

Thus, many of the children in the ghetto may internalize the goals and norms of our society. However, because of their upbringing, they are poorly equipped to compete with the middle class. For example, their home environment does not adequately prepare them to do well in school. These children don't have educational toys. They generally live in "less verbal" households. The importance of education is not stressed. These are some of the factors which, when added to the deep psychological problems which the children already have, enable us to understand the difficulties faced by these children. Added to this is the fact that the children go to inferior, overcrowded schools. Their teachers are usually academically inferior. In addition, the teacher too often is lacking in the ability and willingness to have a sympathetic understanding of and consideration for the pupils. The teacher too often shows little consideration for the child in the classroom. Impatience, apathy, weariness, hostility and incompetence are too often the qualities in the teacher which the anxious and problem-ridden child of the ghetto observes or senses. It is not surprising that the child usually fails in school and in other middle class organizations. Thus, failure adds anxiety and self doubt to his problems.

This leads us into two additional theories of delinquency: namely, Albert Cohen's[3] theory of status deprivation, and Cloward[4] and Ohlin's theory of differential access to goals.

An understanding of our social systems is necessary to understand both theories. David Abrahamson concisely states the American way of life - "our culture is one of competition in which restless, dissatisfied and competative people are involved in an almost merciless struggle for success". Success in American terms means wealth, status, and power.

Drawing upon the works of Merton and Durkheim, Cloward and Ohlin attempt to explain the causes of juvenile delinquency. "It is our view that pressures towards the formation of delinquent subcultures originate in marked discrepancies between culturally indused aspirations among lower class youth and the possibilities of achieving them by legitimate means." Thus, lower classes turn to crime to achieve the goals of success which most Americans have.

This theory is very similar to that of Cohen. He believes that delinquency is a result of the fact that lower class children, since they are constantly "put down" and they fail whenever they come into the domain of the middle class, react against this and repudiate middle class values and form their own value systems in which they can "succeed".

Both theories make sense in broad sociological terms, yet given an understanding of the complex psychological effects of growing up in the ghetto, I would say that they are simply contributing factors in the development of the children under consideration.

At some time in the above scheme, some of the children in the ghetto become delinquent. The initial cause may have been a result of some psychological problems such as hostilities arising in infancy or a result of the prevalent attitudes of his social environment or a lack of opportunity for success, or deprivation of status or a combination of these factors.

In any case, the so-called subculture of delinquency represents a system in which the delinquents establish their own values and support each other to satisfy their needs for status, security and success. Most sociologists say there are three basic types of subcultures which arise depending on the organization of the ghetto:

1. Criminal - In this type, the individual can work his way up in the criminal world, make money, and obtain "respect". Most of the delinquency is "utilitarian".

2. Conflict - In this type, the individual satisfies his needs by renouncing most middle class norms and values. Status is gained by being tough, cool, having heart, and making a lot of girls.

3. Retreatist - In this type, the individual gains respect by taking a lot of drugs, hustling money without much hassle, and being aesthetic, so a sense of superiority is built up.

However, it is important to try and understand if, for the delinquent, the subculture represents an accepted way of life, as Miller seems to indicate, or whether it is rather an escape from the middle class system, as Cloward and Ohlins and Cohen seem to think.

In an attempt to come to some conclusions on the above questions, I will try to elaborate on Merton's chart of different forms of behavior based on norms and goals as it applies to this paper.

In the case of Merton's retreatist category, which includes the Conflict and Retreatist Subcultures, it is possible for the individual to be consciously ambivalent about both his goals and norms. This may produce anxiety. Unconsciously, he could feel his behavior and values to be either right or wrong. If he subconsciously feels that his values are wrong, he is filled with feelings of strain, anxiety and guilt. However, if he has not internalized middle class goals it is possible for him to be well adjusted.

Thus, the attitude of the person depends greatly on his early psychological development and experience, and it is possible to have well-adjusted delinquents and poorly-adjusted delinquents.

Studies in this area have generally pointed out the fact that most delinquents are at least ambivalent about their behavior and values. Short and Strodbeck[5] relate the results of a study of twenty-four gang boys in Chicago. When spoken to individually, each boy felt that the father in a home should be a reliable breadwinner and should exhibit some interest in the children. However, when the group as a whole discussed ideas on family life, they refused to be serious. The group values were not consistent with the individual values.

The delinquents have been rejected by society, yet they have not completely rejected the goals or norms of the society.

As a reaction, they have built up their own society with different goals and norms, yet, deep down many of them don't believe in the way they live. However, they have to live that way to keep any semblance of self-respect.

To live by the codes of the delinquent subculture takes as much effort as to live by middle class standards. It is this fact that makes me believe that if these kids were given an opportunity to get out of this system without sacrificing their last shred of self-respect and were given a chance to live like everybody else, they would probably take advantage of it.

Footnotes

1. New Light On Delinquency and Its Treatment -- Healy
2. Journal of Social Issues Vol. 14 -- W.B. Miller
3. Delinquent Boys -- Albert Cohen
4. Delinquency and Opportunity -- Cloward, Ohlin
5. Group Process And Gang Delinquency -- Short, Strodbeck
6. The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child -- K. Friedlander

The Poor Negro ---- Why?

Clifford Sessions
August 10, 1966
Social Science A

"Greater than the tread of mighty armies
is the idea whose time has arrived."
----Victor Hugo

Sitting in class one day, I could not help but be startled by my instructor's peremptory announcement that about one half of all the Negroes in America are in poverty. This I found out later, was a fact when based upon the statistical evidence of Herman Miller in his book Rich Man Poor Man. This statement started a chain of events in my mind which had me in a mental turmoil, but finally, I resolved to myself that the main reason one half of all my black brothers are poor could only be the lack of human, civil and equal rights and opportunities we have suffered since these things were supposedly guaranteed us one hundred years ago.

Even in the knowledge that all Negroes are in one way or another "underprivileged", whether it be from direct curtailment of rights or from the lack of dignity and feeling of inferiority that is a part of the brainwashing and adverse mental conditioning black men have undergone, it is shocking to me that every other black man is also a poor man. Michael Harrington's poor, which numbers between forty and fifty million, is an awesome number, but if these two statistics are correct, and I can take the freedom to correlate them, an even more awesome statistic is the result. The American Negro, a minority group containing approximately twenty million people is one tenth of the American population, and Negroes are almost one fourth of the total number of people in poverty. This is a sore in front of the eyes of any statistician and one that shouts of/some grave ill, but how often will the average person stop to think, why?, when presented with this fact. It would be facetious to say that is all began with slavery, but any analysis of the problem must start from the very beginning.

Over three hundred years ago, the first ships arrived on the American continent with those who were to be the New World ancestors of the American Negro, the black indentured servants. The fate of the majority of these black men was the beginning of the problem as it exists to this day. Some these early blacks worked off their debts and became free men. Others did not work off their debts and either lived out their lives as indentured servants to pay off the debt, or transferred that debt onto the shoulders of their offspring. In a matter of years the new institution of slavery was introduced and the majority of Negro indentured servants were absorbed into it while still more Negroes were being imported as slaves. Although the original indentured servants were both white and black, the inability of the whites to labor in the hot sun of the plantations gradually made the Negroes the most suitable and likely candidates for slavery.

As the years progressed, slavery evolved into an established part of the young American way of life. The period from the time that the American slavery of the black man became institutionalized to the post-Civil War emancipation of the slaves, was a very critical one in its effects on the personality and character of the American Negro. In the early twentieth century, two great Negro spokesmen advanced ideas about their people. Booker T. Washington represented the philosophy of patience and gradualism.

> He implied that if Negroes proved themselves good "hewers of wood and drawers of water" the whites would reward them with greater economic opportunities and perhaps, eventually, with full equality in society. [1]

W.E.B.Dubois argued on the other hand,

> ...that the Negro would not escape from an inferior status by accepting it, as Washington seemed to suggest. Instead, he contended, Negroes should challenge both the pattern of segregation and the restriction of Negroes to the lower levels of the occupational scale. [2]

---

[1] Lewis Killian and Charles Grigg, Racial Crisis In America, p.5.
[2] Ibid.,p.6.

Now, a full century after our release from bondage, we still suffer under the blight of discrimination which seems also to have adversely affected the Negro's spirit.

> There is a disturbing view held by many Negroes in high places that 300 years of, first, slavery and, then, discrimination have destroyed the inner fiber of the American Negro masses; that, perhaps, they are spiritually incapable of becoming first-class citizens. I

Perhaps the most damaging blow to the Negro's self respect and integrity has been the existence we have had under this 100 year subtle slavery of discrimination. Just how much hs the spiritual deterioration caused by slavery and discrimination contributed to the existence of black poverty as it exists today?

> One hundred years of delay have passed since President Lincoln freed the slaves, yet their heirs, their grandsons are not fully free. They are not freed from the bonds of injustice. They are not yet freed from social and economic oppression. 2

Using income as a measure of economic ststus, as Miller did to conclude that 50% of the Negroes are poor, one sees a pathetic picture. As Miller goes on to say,

> The **price** that Negroes pay for their dark skins is nowhere more obvious than in employment. In almost every group of jobs they earn less money than whites because they hold the lowest paying jobs in that group. They are clerks instead of managers, laborers instead of bricklayers, machine operators instead of toolmakers But this is only part of their disadvantage. They often get lower pay even when doing exactly the same work as whites. White men earn more simply because they are white, regardless of the job. 3

This is the economic discrimination the Negro faces after his century of freedom and yet, the problem cannot be reduced to such a simplistic argument. There seems to be a direct relation between the Negro's problem of

---

1. Louis E. Lomax, The Negro Revolt, p.225.
2. Herman P. Miller, Rich Man Poor Man, p.96.
3. Ibid., pp.101-102.

economic discrimination and many other ills that affect the black man.

> This economic straitjacket has everything to do with the breakdown of family life and general morality in the Negro community; it is the basic explanation for the inordinate Negro crime rate; it is fundamental cause of our high welfare rolls and abundant relief chiseling; this is why we live in slums, and this is precisely why we have to gang up -- brothers, sisters, cousins, aunts, every family we can gather -- to buy homes outside the Negro ghetto; and as a result of ganging up we bring social and economic deterioration to the once all-white communities. 1

Before any meanignful progress is made, many feelings, attitudes and prejudices on the parts of employers must change, and then, the legal and constitutional enforcement of equal rights may be undertaken.

Another factor influencing the mental attitudes of the Negro and contributiong toward his poverty is his educational problem. Segregation in education actually began with the Jim Crow laws after the Civil War. Armed with the Supreme Court Decision in the case of Plessey vs. Ferguson (1896), that separate but equal facilities met the demands of the constitution, the Southerners pressed forward their program of segregation. Authorized opposition to this policy was not existent until another court decision in 1954 (Brown vs. Board of Education, Topeka, Kansas) ruled that separate educational facilities were inherently unequal In 1955, the Supreme Court issued an order demanding an end to racial segregation in public schools, "with all deliberate speed", but set no deadline. Accordingly, some states have completely integrated their school systems or have taken the first major strides in doing so, some have grudgingly only taken the first steps toward obeying the court order, and still others have actively resisted integration attempts by closing down schools and using local militia to prevent the registration of students.

---

1. Louis E. Lomax, The Negro Revolt, p. 80.

In 1957 when Orval Faubus, Governor of Arkansas, used the state's National Guard to prevent nine Negro children from entering an all-white Little Rock high school, President Eisenhower sent in U.S. Army units and Federal marshalls to restore order and squelch riots by the locally encouraged segregationists. Under Federal protection, the nine children attended the previously all-white school. Again in 1962, another "Deep South" incident erupted when the Governor of Mississippi, Ross Barnett, defied Federal Court Orders and refused James Meredith, a qualified Negro Air Force Veteran, admission to "Ole Miss", the all-white University of Mississippi.

> Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black ruled that "Ole MIss" must admit James Meredith. But Dem. Governor Ross Barnett has no intention of complying. He demanded that all state officials "uphold and enforce the laws duly and legally enacted by the legislature and interpose state sovereignty and themselves between the people of the state and anybody politically seeking to usurp such power". For his part, he was willing to go to jail rather than accept Black's order, and he advised any official "who is not prepared to suffer imprisonment for this righteous cause" to resign. [1]

Federal troops and marshalls again had to be sent in to enforce the court orders and to protect the student while at classes. These two incidents of the die-hard South oppose civil rights even to the extent of insurrection against the national government, show the attitudes and intensity of feeling shown by some Southern whites. The Ole Miss incident particularly foreshadowed a hot battle in the South.

> It was recognized as the gravest conflict between federal and and state authority since the Civil War. It hovered at the edge of violence and was filled with the potential of tragedy. [2]

---

1. "This righteous cause", Time, 80:23, September 21, 1962.
2. "Edge of Violence", Time, 80:15, October 5, 1962.

At present the school integration fight has settled down to a series of test cases wherein individuals file suits against different city, county and state school systems and force (with favorable court decisions) integration. There is also developing a fight against the de facto school segregation which has resulted from the concentration of Negroes in urban centers and ghettoes across the nation. Under attack is the "districting" which forces the children of a certain neighborhood to attend only certain schools. Since the neighborhoods are oftan Negro inhabited slums, the schools lack proper maintenance and racial balance, and "have become citadels of bad conduct, crime, poorly prepared teachers, and racial frustrations".[1] Michael Harrington says of these schools,

> Their schools are crowded; the instruction is inferior; and the neighborhood is omnipresent and more powerful than the classroom. 2

Unfortunately, there is also evidence that the psychology of the Negro poor is such that together with his environment, he does not have the incentive or the encouragement to perform well under the present American educational system. As Herman Miller points out........

> The fact is that in 1959 the average nonwhite with four years of college could expect to earn less over a lifetime than the white who did not go beyond the eighth grade. 3

Together with this discouraging fact and the discrediting factors that belittle educational endeavor which affect the young Negro, it is hard for him to see the use of some of the "academics" he must endure. This is especially true for the adolescent Negro when he must reason that Algebra and History will get him a better job and more pay. Despite these

---

1. Louis E. Lomax, The Negro Revolt, p. 171.
2. Michael Harrington, The Other America, p. 67.
3. Herman P. Miller, Rich Man Poor Man, p. 163.

obstacles, it appears to me that more of my Negro counterparts, whether they understand it or not, have begun to place considerable value in "that piece of paper" as the high school diploma is most affectionally known. To do this takes no profound insight into the workings of modern America, politics or the like, for we have only to look around at our parens, our neighbors, and our friends, and see (if not feel) the poverty. "The cash value of education" as Lomax calls it, is positive, so the lack of schooling has undoubtedly been a factor in black poverty. The late President Kennedy had a few words to say about equal education in a speech to the public in late 1961.

> ....we live in the most dangerous period of the history of man. Our very existence as a nation is endangered by the Soviet Union, a nation that is developing the brainpower of its children to its highest potential. Already the Soviet Union has outstripped us in certain areas of scientific and technological development. If we are to survive, we must keep up pace with, if not surpass the Soviets in science and engineering. To accomplish this, we must give every single one of our children the best educational opportunities possible for intellectual development. Not one child can be excluded; the one left out may have the intellectual potential of another Teller.[1]

Having briefly considered the economic and educational aspects of the Negro in poverty, some of the sociological and psychological results that poverty has brought on the black individual are interesting. A look at Black poverty show it is rather unique when you consider the poor masses in the world's history, for the American Negro as a "race" is a truly American occurrence, and so too is American Negro poverty.

> Negro poverty is unique in every way. It grows out of a long American history, and it expresses itself in a subculture that is built up on an interlocking base of

---

1. V.C. Blum, "Freedom in American Education", Vital Speeches, January 1, 1962.

> economic and racial injustice. It is a fact imposed from without, from white America.[1]

The Negro has two particular disadvantages which did not hinder the assimilation of other minority groups into the American society, the lack of a common "old country" heritage and black skin.

> The do not huddle together around a language and a common memory from overseas, saving, planning, waiting for the breakthrough, isolated from the lures of the easy life in the magazines and on television.[2]

And furthermore, even if this lack of a tradition could be discounted as a factor in giving the Negro's poverty and his rejection from the American society "a quality of psychological depth and torment that is unique among all the impoverished people in the United States",[3] nevertheless,

> Unlike America's other ethnic groups, the Negro has not been able to "join" the American people by dint of education and income. His skin is still his prison.[4]

Michael Harrington elaborates on this fact in saying,

> The Negro is poor because he is black; that is obvious enough. But, perhaps more importantly, the Negro is black because he is poor. The laws against color can be removed, but that will leave the poverty that is the historic and institutionalized consequence of color. As long as this is the case, being born a Negro will continue to be the most profound disability that the United States imposes upon a citizen.[5]

The most telling effect of the Negro's history that I have noticed has been the crushed, demoralized feature of defeat with which it brands some. The destructive forces of lack of self-confidence, lack of self-respect, despair, laziness, bitterness, militancy, defensiveness, etc., are enough to ride the back of any poor Negro and break his spirit before long. Today, with the hope of breaking the final shackles, there is purpose and direction put into the lives of some of the black masses. The cry

---

1. Michael Harrington, The Other America, p. 64.
2. Ibid., p. 67.
3. Ibid., p. 66.
4. Raymond W. Mack, Race, Class and Power, p. 17.
5. Harrington, op. cit., p.73.

is lifted to stand up and be counted among the Black men of America! This is inspiring to every black man, but we must remember that we black-skinned people, the members of a hybrid race, form only one tenth of and live in a white world, that anyone "having a known trace of Negro blood -- no matter how far back it was acquired -- is classified as a Negro."[1] White segregationists often argue "racial purity" in their appeal to both white and black "race pride" to avoid racial intermarriage, and thus keep the respective bloods "pure". But this is a comic argument when you consider that so many of the American Negroes today have well known or obvious white ancestry.

> The Negro is amused at the idea of keeping his blood pure, owing to the fact that the large majority of American Negroes already have white and Indian ancestry as well as African Negro blood. In general they are aware of this fact. [2]

An overriding and deterring factor in the institution of integration, the mixing of the races and the development of meaningful race relations in the U.S. today is ignorance and a lack of communication and understanding between black and white.

> The white person, no matter how liberal he may be, exists in the cocoon of a white-dominated society. Living in a white residential area, sending his children to white schools, moving in exclusively white social circles, he exert a special effort to expose himself to the actual conditions under which large numbers of Negroes live. Even when such exposure occurs, his perception is likely to be superficial and distorted. The substandard house may be overshadowed in his eyes by the television aerial or the automobile outside the house. Even more important, he does not perceive the subjective inequalities inherent in the system of segregation because he does not experience them daily as a Negro does. Simply stated, the white American lives almost all his life in a white world. The Negro American lives a large part of his life in a white world also, but in a world in which he is stigmatized. [3]

---

1. Arnold Rose, The Negro In America, p.42.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 22.
3. Lewis Killian and Charles Grigg, *Racial Crisis In America*, p. 73.

This social stigma makes for an extreme race consciousness, race pride and even militance when it is driven on to its end. In contrast to this, the white man need seldom think of his skin color, living in a white world, one with few (10%) Negroes in it.

> While there is little that the Negro may do that does not remind him of his status as a Negro, the white man does not most of the time think of himself primarily as a white man. The Negro lives as an outsider in the white man's world. The white man, even though he may disapprove of it, is an insider in this world. [1]

The lack of understanding between blacks and whites and the resulting conscious or unconscious prejudice that develops, fosters feelings like "the common white opinion of the racial inferiority of the Negro people and the whites' intense dislike of intermarriage".[2] Ignorance is also the reason that "the alleged racial inferiority of the Negro, his animal-like nature, his unreliability, his low morals, dirtiness and unpleasant manners",[3] are used as rationalizations for the denial of social equality and resistance to the enforcement of integration. Particularly in the South, where the white power structure is in control almost to the exclusion of any black representation, the Negro is kept "in his place" by the injustices of prejudice, discrimination and outright suppression. For without economic opportunity, education, political power and social equality, the Negro must stay in the category of "his place". This place will be in poverty, and as second-class citizens. Many people feel that the vote is the key to the "why" of black poverty and that black franchise will be the crutch the Negro needs to begin to lift himself onto the plane of equality. But consider, even after 100 years, several constitutional amendments, poll taxes, grandfather clauses, literacy tests,

---

1. Lewis Killian and Charles Grigg, Racial Crisis In America, p 95.
2. Arnold Rose, The Negro In America, p. 22.
3. Ibid., p. 202.

filibusters, three major civil rights laws and voter registration drives, not all qualified Negro voters can vote. The right to vote and thus secure representation in government will only be a fact once the executive of the national government makes up its mind, takes the initiative and forces it on those who reluctantly impede its institution.

We are at a critical time in the history of America, when the masses of the black man seem to have become impatient with the slow course of progress in the obtainment of his rights. The Negro himself wants to know not only "Why am I poor?", but "Why must I remain poor?". The result is a movement that is gathering momentum and promises to attain the proportions of a social revolution in short order.

> It has become painfully evident in thepast few years that, unless the nation begins to take longer strides on the first mile of the long road to equality and integration, the Negro revolt will change from a non-violent one into a violent one. [1]

The growing impatience of the Negro is being played upon by some Negro leaders who themselves are impatient with the speed of the existing movement, and a new Negro solidarity and nationalism which is frightening to the whites, is the product. If common sentiment is consolidated, organized and nurtured on the resentment, hate, bitterness, mistrust, and anxiety of the poor black masses, with enough provocation or the lack of appeasement, the dimensions and intensity of this Negro revolt could well mushroom into a situation justifying cattle prods, police dogs and fire hoses. Indeed, white church congregations may start to pray with one eye cocked towards the windows for "stray bombs". Numerically, the violent Negro will be crushed, but will the crushed hands and heads he leaves to tell of his rampage awaken the ignorant?

---

1. Lewis Killian and Charles Grigg, Racial Crisis In America, p. 143.

James Baldwin reflects the impatience of the black man with his wry remark, "At the rate things are going, all of Africa will be free before we can get a lousy cup of coffee." Some of us Negroes have come to feel that "white people will never yield, that we will spend the remainder of our lives waging a major war over a morsel."[1] But whether the revolt takes on a violent pattern or not, it seems that "this era will be one in which neither personal goodwill nor mutual understanding, but impersonal power, will be the most significant factor in race relations."[2] Until now, the proverb in dealing with the white man on racial lines has been: "Blessed is he who expects nothing, for he shall not be disappointed."[3] But the Negro now expects, and besides his "take", he feels little conscience trouble whether he should "give" or not. The truth is that most Negroes do not feel they have unequalified moral obligations to white people.[4] The result is that the Negro, half of whom is poor, is ready to stand up, proud of his blackness and sometimes defiant in it, and take his due.

I can offer no solution to the problem of black poverty, but the very first step would seem to be a knowledge of it. I have attempted to shed some light on the darkness that shrouds and the clouds of ignorance and prejudice that obscure this topic. And I have an idea, that something must be done about poverty, white as well as black, or it will do something, both to itself and to America.

---

1. Louis E. Lomax, The Negro Revolt, p. 187.
2. Killian and Grigg, Racial Crisis In America, p. 8.
3. Raymond W. Mack, Race, Class and Power, p. 17.
4. Arnold Rose, The Negro In America, p. 248.

Bibliography

Harrington, Michael, The Other America, Baltimore, 1962.

Killian, Lewis M., and Griggs, Charles M., Racial Crisis In America, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964.

Lomax, Louis E., The Negro Revolt, New York, 1963.

Mack, Raymond W., Race, Class and Power, New York, 1963.

Miller, Herman P., Rich Man Poor Man, New York, 1964.

Rose, Arnold, The Negro In America, Boston, 1948.

Bennett, L., "Birth of Jim Crow", Ebony, 17:104-113, August, 1962.

Bickel, A.M., "Civil Rights, the Kennedy Record", New Republic, 147:11-16, December 15, 1962

Blum, V.C., "Freedom in American Education," Vital Speeches, 28:189-192, January 1, 1962.

"Civil Rights", New Republic, 145"6-7, October 9, 1961.

"Edge of Violence", Time, 80:15-17, October 5, 1962.

Meehan, T., "Moynihan of the Moynihan Report", New York Times Magazine, July 31, 1966.

"This righteous cause; first Negro to attempt to register at the University of Mississippi", Time, 80:23, September 21, 1962.

Quarles, B., "One Hundred Years of Freedom", Negro Historical Bulletin, 25:98+, February, 1962.

ANALYSIS AND APPRAISAL OF THE PROGRAM

Prepared by Eugene Lichtenstein, 253 W. 101 Street, New York City.
Member of the Program Staff and Program Evaluator.

I. REVIEW OF THE PROGRAM

Officially, Cornell University listed the project as Social Science A, a new introductory course for first year students. It was designed as an experimental summer class for students who had been admitted to a college for entrance in the following fall term. It carried six credits, ungraded, which tied in neatly with a new policy at Cornell that permitted students to select one class (or three credits) each term for a Pass or Fail grade. In my notes, though, I see that the summer students began to refer to the class, after the second week, as "the summer at Cornell." By itself, this is hardly surprising. But it reflected, I think, the students' sense that the course extended out beyond the confines of the classroom; that it affected them in a non-academic way; and indeed that the course, and the summer, were inseparable.

Certainly the professors did not list this as their central intention. The statement by Douglas Dowd on pages two and three (Section 1), and the "Draft for the Principles Underlying a Course in Social Science" contained in Section 2, (written by Michael Maccoby and endorsed by the rest of the faculty), give some idea as to what the staff hoped to achieve. And yet, implicit in the faculty's approach was the notion that the classroom was part of the student's life, and not a separate academic partition. So while analysis and inquiry were stressed during the lectures and discussion, there was nevertheless a concern, even an interest in, the student's personality and character.

In part, this was a response (of the faculty) to the particular identity of the students who comprised the class. Twelve of them---all Negroes---were classified as enrollees under Cornell's Disadvantaged Students Program. Their presence forced a particular kind of reality into the classroom just as it invaded "the summer at Cornell." Many of the students---in fact most of them--- had had little contact with Negroes or with slum poverty. Most of them began the course with the idea that, ultimately, "we all get what we deserve." In translation this came out to mean that the poor were lazy and shiftless but could improve their lot if they would only try harder.

The faculty, obviously, disagreed with this interpretation; in fact disapproved of it. They came at the students from different disciplines, and with different approaches, armed with evidence, studies and theories. Always, of course, there were the Negroes themselves---in the class, in the dormitory, in the dining hall. By midsummer most of the white students had neatly separated the Negro students in the class from those who lived in the slums. But the Negro students refused to permit this. As one of them stressed after seeing the picture The Cool World, "That's us; that's our world, and the gang is who we are." (This was in the men's dormitory, at midnight, during an impromptu discussion with nearly all the male students present.)

In part, too, I think the professors interest in the students was something that they had brought with them to Cornell. By inclination they were oriented as much to teaching as they were to research. Thrown together in a project that they were designing, excited intellectually by their discussions following the class, affected by the diversity among the students (and particularly the presence of the Negro students) the "summer at Cornell" and the course became one for the four professors.

Moreover a number of external factors forced this particular form of socialization for both students and faculty. The students found themselves attending one class together that ran from nine in the morning until noon. (This included discussion sections and a half hour break.) They all took their meals together (i.e. lunch and dinner) in a special, small dining room and the girls had breakfast there as well; (there were no special arrangements for breakfast for the boys, and they tended to drift into the university commons before class in the morning.) In addition, the students were grouped together in particular wings of the men and women's dormitories respectively. Thursday evenings they all attended a film, as part of the course, and stayed afterward for a class discussion. And each evening, after dinner, approximately half of the group gathered together for an informal game of volley ball, about 100 yards away from the dining hall.

To be sure they did not always function as one large group; evenings, a half dozen or so of the boys often visited one of the local beer parlors and played pool; a small percentage found dates from outside the group. Only one couple "dated" in the group; for the rest, the boys and girls were friendly but on a community rather than a sexual basis; some went off to the library, others to play ball. But their community consisted of the fifty-three members of the class.

There were some isolationists, of course. One highly intelligent, exceptionally competitive boy took an extreme dislike to the faculty's approach. He felt they moralized a great deal but said very little. He resented what he took to be authoritarianism and "too much personalizing." Except for athletics, he cut himself off from the group much of the time. Another boy also became antagonistic (to the faculty). But he was regarded as a loner by the other students, a bit strange, with few familiar edges that they could grasp.

The Negro students huddled together a good deal of the time, much to the consternation of the faculty. This was particularly evidenced at the end of the first week when the faculty took lunch with the students and discovered that the whites didn't join the Negroes at the tables. The professors joined a number of the tables and raised the issue with the students, Negro and white. Thereafter there was freer intermixing during meals, but the Negroes formed a clique of their own. The point was, though, that all groups were open. One could observe set patterns at the dining table; but they never were exclusive patterns. Negroes and whites could move freely from one group to another.

In short, with the absence of fraternities, and with the knowledge that they were all pre-freshmen and part of an experimental course, the outline of the society was determined for the students before they arrived. Had there been two to three hundred, matters may have been different; but with fifty-three students, and the two most visible groups consisting of Negro students from predominantly Negro communities and Boston Irish Catholic girls (generally from middle and lower class families), there were no threatening or competitive social groups that any student had to fear. There was the possibility, of course, that the handful of students from private school and the more intellectual students from high powered public schools might set themselves apart. However this never occurred...one reason being that these students were interested in precisely the kind of experience(s) that the more articulate (male) Negroes had to offer; another reason, too, was that several of the Negro students were exceptional (though not academically) and this was recognized by the group as a whole. And then, of course, there was the subject of the class itself: "Why in a rich society are there so many poor people?" It made class consciousness somewhat suspect.

I've tried to convey some sense of what the student community or group sense was like, for I believe it was an important element in the summer program. We have been led to believe that often there is a dividing line on campus between learning (i.e. what takes place in the classroom) and the student culture; and that it is the latter which plays a dominant role in the student's academic life. During the summer at Cornell the faculty in Social Science A tried to reverse things. They suggested that inquiry, analysis, and intellectualism need not---in fact should not---be cut off from the life outside of class; that there really should be no separation in a man's (or student's) life.

Not that it was stated in precisely this manner; nor was there a conscious effort to manipulate or use the student culture. It was much more a personal response by professors to the students, and to the situation. Let me give some examples:
1) On the most superficial level, there was the question of students' names. By the end of the first two weeks, the professors knew all (or nearly all) the students by name. There was no policy or collective decision, but the students were called by their first name after several conversations (after class or in the dining hall), and by last name when the acquaintance was still only a formal one, restricted to the classroom. At the end of four weeks, nearly everyone was called by his or her first name. (The students addressed the faculty as Mr. or Professor Dowd, etc.)
2) Mondays were reserved by the faculty for lunch with the students. It was informal, cafeteria style, with one or two pro-

fessors joining each table of eight or nine students. The graduate students, i.e. the three section leaders, participated too. From the response of the students on questionnaires, the presence of the faculty at lunch was enormously beneficial. This was where they felt they met with the professors, socialized with them, and raised questions that emerged from the films and the classroom. They would have preferred that this had been included more frequently---say three times a week or every day. It was an important point of contact for them. But it was equally important for the professors too. They gained a sense of the social currents, the dynamics of the group; and they could also pick up some clue as to what was getting across in class. The faculty noted that the Negro students were sitting at separate tables at their first Monday luncheon. This fact had been pointed out to them very early in the term by the Negro section leader, who had mentioned it both at faculty meetings and in the general lectures. The faculty acted upon it by talking directly to the students. It was also at the dining table that they were able to sort out personalities, and speak informally to individuals instead of a group.

3) The lectures were another point of contact with the student culture. For the most part, the lectures were conducted in what might be called high intellectual style. They were analytical, high powered, well organized. In one sense, they were aimed at peers---that is, at the other professors---for there was a genuine commitment by the four to work out the interdisciplinary dimensions of social science particularly as they affected the question of poverty in America. The professors had not prepared their lectures before the summer; indeed they had not decided what the lectures would consist of, or in what order they would be delivered. This was sketched out during the July Fourth week-end, just prior to the opening day of class. This procedure had decided drawbacks. First, the reading assignments were not adequately co-ordinated. Students were engulfed during the opening week with a battery of assignments---the first two days in economics; the next two in psychology; and the following two in sociology. There were no textbooks per se; instead the assignments called for reading particular works (see reading list, Appendix A in Section 1). When the students discovered that 1) it was difficult to keep up with the reading; and 2) that the lectures were not about particular books, they soon stopped preparing for class.

Second, the section leaders were placed at a disadvantage. They not only had to lead a section discussion on a subject in which they might have limited competence, but they often did not know the content of the lecture until it was actually given. This was modified after it became clear that they needed more advanced briefing.

Finally, the impromptu nature of the scheduling confused the students. That is, in the opening weeks, the sense of scaffolding, of relationships among the four disciplines was not clear to most of the students. They felt assaulted by a battery of strange subjects and new information, most of which did not seem to fit. Along about the third week, continuity became more apparent, as the professors themselves began to build on one another's insights and to see relationships among the disciplines. By that time a number of the students had already been lost, had stopped reading, and had been bypassed by the lectures.

What held some of the students, though, was the other side of the coin. While the course had not been prepared in advance, it was instead being worked out, "discovered", in front of the students. The commitment of the professors was genuine; and their interest and intellectual concern was affecting. Moreover, while there was much that was said in class that sailed overhead, there were points that the students did grasp, particularly those directed at (their own) culture and personality.

It was here that Michael Maccoby's contribution was so important. That he was a psychoanalyst and not a psychology professor was crucial. For what he dealt with---despite its intellectual content and rigor---really was the human personality. He spoke with an authority that reached the students. Moreover, he was a moralist, and in his lectures---at times personalized, often with value judgments directed at the students---he would touch on points that seemed to reach individual students directly. It is clear---from the questionnaires and interviews I had with students---that he "touched them". For they either found him the professor they liked (or disliked) most. The majority were affirmative.

Douglas Dowd often would personalize as well. And when a student (or the class) responded in a way that he (or Michael Maccoby) thought foolish or indifferent, either one would challenge the student immediately, and aggressively. In a way, the foolish answer seemed "to be letting the side down". Initially, the students found this disconcerting ("it was too personal, and too aggressive"); and the combined challenges of several professors could be overwhelming. One result was that a number of students claimed they stopped asking questions. But as the summer proceeded, many of the other students began to see the challenges in another light. For one, they had begun to perceive that the professors really were in earnest about the subject and were not play-acting. Second, on an inchoate level, they took the sharp comments as a form of inclusion in the enterprise; i.e. everyone in the classroom---students, section leaders, and professors---was engaged in an intellectual effort. Not that these attitudes were unmixed. In interviews with students, I would usually hear what sounded like a contradictory statement---resentment on the one hand at the faculty for "personal attacks directed against one or more students" for views that differed from those held by the professors and simultaneously, respect and admiration for the level at which the course was pitched and the fervor which the faculty displayed.

I think what I was hearing was a combined statement of attitudes held during the first two weeks and those that evolved by the last two (which was when I interviewed the students). The summer was just too brief, and there was not enough "turn around" time for attitudes both to change and to be sorted out. Perhaps the best indice of change (and response-resentment) was the fact that from half of the students to two-thirds believed (during the early part of the term) that, (a) the professors were foisting a point of view on them ("we're being brainwashed"), and that,(b) there was total agreement, intellectual and political, among the professors. They were all socialists, according to this student view. By the end of the term, few students believed that the professors were in agreement, or that they were forcing "a line" on the students. (At summer's end about fifteen percent of the students still held this view and they felt this was only partially true.)

4) The Thursday evening films were another point of interaction. One film was shown each week (except for the first week when we played two documentaries), with a discussion immediately following the film. Two feature films were used---The Cool World (a film about a Negro gang in Harlem, and The Young and the Damned, (a Mexican film by Luis Bunuel about a gang of young teen-age boys in Mexico City)---as well as a number of documentaries, some directly on the subject of poverty, others more concerned with American youth culture. (Among the films shown were Sixteen Webster Groves, Football, Harvest of Shame, California's Proposition 14.) After one film (Proposition 14), Douglas Dowd forced the students to face the question of how they would vote in California, given the open housing proposition (14) that had been the subject of the film. There had been great stress laid in earlier class sessions on the need for honesty (with one's self), and on the fact that many of the students were refusing to confront the subject matter in the class directly and personally; that they were actually afraid of any deep emotional engagement, for it might challenge their beliefs and their images about self and society. The question posed by Douglas Dowd then was built on the earlier criticism that had been levelled by Michael Maccoby. The students responded gropingly, but in a personal way. That is, a number of them explained that "while they weren't prejudiced", they would still vote against compulsory integrated housing, because they believed a person should be free to rent or sell his property to whomever he chose. Intellectually, their argument never became more than a repetition of beliefs held; and it was for this that the faculty pounced upon them. However, it was largely interpreted by the students as a concerted attack by the professors against those in the class deviating from the accepted line. Friction was perhaps bitterest at this point (the third week of the term); but the fact that the students had openly expressed themselves, had admitted to themselves and the class that they believed there were other priorities that superceded integration, this had an exceptionally cathartic effect. It did not create particular cleavages between whites and Negroes (most of the Negro students claimed they knew that many of the white students were prejudiced; this was confirmatory); rather it eased whatever suspicion had previously existed. And it permitted a new kind of openness among the students. That is, once the position was acknowledged, the students (all of them) were able to explore what its consequences were---for themselves as well as for others.

The "others" were only too patently sharing class, meals, dormitory space, etc. By summer's end, most of the "segregationists" had altered their position. But---and this was the important point---not because some "of their friends and classmates were Negroes." Rather they had puzzled through the implications and consequences of their stand. They had some notion of the price this would exact---in economic, political and psychological terms---and it was this (not a change of heart) that effected a change in the argument. I know that this was the tone of the dialogue that was raised with me (and initiated by the students) during meals that I took with the students. (In the last two weeks of the term I had lunch with the students four days each week, and breakfast with the boys approximately three days each week.) To be sure, the presence of the Negro classmates was important. However most of the students were able to move from the personal to the analytic and back again, on this particular issue. This conversion of attitudes and experience to some kind of intellectual inquiry was a major thrust of the course.

II. AN APPRAISAL

What I have suggested, then, is that a rather informal summer community was established, somewhat apart from the total Cornell University summer session. It was a community characterized by openness (one could leave or re-enter easily and without accounting to the group) and a lack of tension. The Social Science course became a binding element. Not only did it order and prescribe much of the day's routine (and determine the students' living arrangements), but it was also an intellectual enterprise in which the faculty quite consciously included the students; i.e. together, they would explore the dimensions of the problem, and in fact together work out an interdisciplinary social science course. The reality of this process---or perhaps the truth of it---was not perceived (perhaps believed?) by the students until the summer term was nearly concluded; and then by only some of the students (about one-third).

I think it is obvious that, given the resources, one can structure an informal community on campus which students and faculty can feel free to join (or not). My understanding is that this generally is not done by the faculty. The students can choose to join a fraternity; or else move freely between dormitory and/or rooms off campus. A host of clubs, teams, interest groups---generally organized and run by students---is available under the heading of extra-curricula activities. And then of course there are classes, majors and minors and required credits,etc. But the two are quite separate.

At Cornell, though, as part of the experimental course, there was an attempt to make the classwork relevant beyond the confines of the class; to make it a community concern. With this as given, the questions on the academic side that need to be looked at, I think, are: 1) What were the inputs?, and 2) How well did they succeed?

1) I alluded in the earlier pages to the relative lack of planning much in advance of the summer. The advantage this offered was spontaneity on the part of professors, as they grappled with the subject matter. Their interest and their sense of discovery were communicated to the students. The value of this cannot be overstated. What was needed, though, was some advanced planning of *structure...and of tactics*. Thus, for example, a term paper had been assigned the opening day of the term. It was, I believe, almost a reflex decision on the part of the staff. (There were after all no graded exams; no tests for students.) This would be the students' independent contribution. By the third week, however, it occurred to most of the professors that a short weekly piece of writing---anywhere from one to X number of pages---might have been preferable, given the character of the course. There would be more continuous student responsibility (and contributions) and more sustained contact between professors nnd students. Similarly, some advance planning might have sorted out the scheduled reading assignments; and this need not have cut into the spontaneity.

2) The handling of the sections by the three graduate students became a major concern. To some extent the fault was that of the professors (and inadequate planning). I talked to the three section leaders at the beginning of the term and they indicated that they were unclear as to what was expected of them. Each had his area of expertise (economics, psychology, and political science), and made no claim to depth in the other fields. Furthermore, they felt that the professors had not communicated just what it was that the sections were to accomplish. Should they explain the lecture? Should they stress specific points and, if so, which points? Should they encourage the students to discuss issues that emerged from the lecture?

Their problem was confounded, in the first weeks, by the absence of advanced notice. They knew the subject of the lecture but little more than its general outline. After some discussion of this, the faculty recognized it would be necessary to write out something for the section leaders, perhaps citing the major points to be covered in the lecture. This became the adopted procedure in the latter part of the term. However, until just about the end of the course, the section leaders were never clear precisely what the nature of their role was to be.

The uncertainty was also a reflection of the ambiguous position that they had been assigned in the course. Initially they were told---as was the class---that there were seven instructors, consisting of four professors and three graduate students. All would participate, contribute, explore; all were equal. Yet it became clear very early in the summer, that the section leaders had a dependent role. They were excluded from some meetings; they did not have responsibility for planning; they were subject to decisions made by the four professors. Also, while *they* were the section leaders, nevertheless the professors sat in on the sections and, at times, controlled them. It was only after three weeks had gone by that some movement to keep faculty out of the sections was proposed. And then it was proposed by the four professors; they had sensed that their presence weakened the section leader's position.

One good thing that came out of these conflicts was the determination to air them at general meetings (of the seven) held each week. It usually proceeded with frank statements by one or several of the four professors, and then comments and candor from the section leaders. The meeting made clear to the professors that, while they had come together with a commitment to interdisciplinary programs, the graduate students, for all of their earnest intentions, needed to be weaned away from the prevailing university system. One proposal was that a seminar for the graduate students should be given prior to offering the course to undergraduates; in short, to train the section leaders the preceding year.

I think the whole construct is wrong. Communication and interaction with the students takes place in the sections for more than it does in the lecture hall. The sections are crucial. Why then give the responsibility to the least well trained member of the faculty? The professors should run the sections (it's costlier, but worth it), and the graduate students should prepare the lectures. This would provide the latter with considerable experience, and at the same time afford the students an easier intellectual target to criticize. Failing this, then the professors might rotate on the lectures---each one taking three or four consecutive days---and simply skip the section during the days he lectures. (Students can be parcelled out to other sections, or the section can be run by a graduate student.) The graduate students, in addition to lecturing, would also participate in one of the sections.

3) Weekly or fortnightly papers, brief or long, at the student's discretion, seem to me preferable to a term paper. Writing can be criticized in a sustained and continuous way, as can contact between individual students and the professor. Most important of all, though, it gives the student a specific (and real, one hopes) responsibility. It offers him a way to participate.

4) The lectures were bright intellectual achievements, for the most part, but they sailed past many of the students. The latter were simply not accustomed to sitting through an hour lecture, particularly when they did not have a "handle" for much of the material. Towards the end of the term they began to see patterns emerging; (although most of the students did pickup salient points that came out of the lectures.) The half hour discussion following the lecture tended to be dominated by the rest of the faculty with the students functioning as audience. I think the course would have benefitted if the professors had experimented with instructional techniques. That is, if they had cut some lectures to thirty minutes and conducted a discussion the remainder of the hour (with the students); or if they had extrapolated a number of issues from the material they wanted to present and posed these

to the class somewhat in the fashion of a law class discussing a case. There is always opportunity to make points in a classroom, to speak at length on a given subject. The important element in teaching is to find a series of proper contexts for issues and analysis and to provide possibilities for those contexts to emerge. Lectures are only one form of teaching; given a class of fifty-three students, all of whom comprise a loose, informal social group, I think that using lectures alone is a wrong tack, particularly for freshmen.

My view on this is a minority one. But I believe the students could have learned more had the pattern of instruction varied. (I think they would have read more of the assignments as well.) How can one measure this? The only written material that we have consists of the term papers plus the answers to the question, "Why in a rich society like America are there so many poor people?" That the answers the last day are superior to those given the first day (when the question was directed at the students without advance warning) is obvious. My reading of a majority of the answers is that the students substituted a set of values that they collected in class for a set of attitudes that they had brought with them to class in the beginning. The former are preferable to the latter. But I'm not clear as to how the student's ability to analyze has sharply improved. I disagree with Douglas Dowd's conclusion, namely the explanation that while the subject of poverty was complex, too complex for the students to deal with adequately, the recognition of this was an encouraging sign. I saw it as facile. I am not sure that time would not have been an ally here; that over a six month period, or a year, the students would have acquired more knowledge, more analytic equipment. I am sure they would have read more. But given the brief time allowed, I think more could have been communicated, more effectively, to more students, had the lecture system been altered. The answers to the essay I find unconvincing, except in a relatively few instances. To me, this was the disappointing part of the course. It was a reflection, I believe, of too few demands made of the students. I agree that tests and grades are not the answer. But in the absence of coercion, some other ways of earning the student's commitment are needed. Co-opting him into a community, and then having the professors perform all the work (and derive all the intellectual pleasure) is not sufficient. It is enough to sustain the brightest sutdents, who can feed off of the professors' discussions and labors; but the rest are just given a new diet. What is wanted are several ways (or structures) for the student to assume some kind of meaningful task that is relevant to the class. For some, it might be to explore one or more questions with one of the professors (and so to embark on a set of readings and, perhaps, some data gathering); for others, it might be interviews and field study. These were attempted during the summer in connection with the term paper towards the close of the summer. Most of the students were delighted, finally, with something that they were to do. (Reading for class, particularly when its relevance was not always apparent, was not enough), It just came too late, and without enough continuity or preparation.